

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXII, 4

WHOLE No. 248

## A STUDY OF GREEK SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to determine how sentence construction changes during the long period from Homer to Dinarchus and what are the personal as distinct from the chronological characteristics of this or that author's sentences. The material analysed<sup>1</sup> can be grouped as follows: Homer; the messenger speeches of tragedy; Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plato; the orators of the fourth century. To compare the sentences a notation<sup>2</sup> was necessary which would reduce the passages to their essentials. The essentials of sentence con-

<sup>1</sup> 750 B. C. (?), Homer, Z 466-H 158; 490-480 B. C., Aeschylus, *Supplices*, 605 f.; 480-470 B. C., Aeschylus, *Persae*, 353 f.; 470-460 B. C., Aeschylus, *Septem*, 375 f. (speeches of the messenger only); 460-450 B. C., Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 636 f., *Prometheus Vinctus*, 640 f.; 450-440 B. C., Sophocles, *Ajax*, 748 f., *Antigone*, 1192 f.; 440-430 B. C., Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 899 f.; Euripides, *Medea*, 1136 f.; Herodotus, III, 14-26; 430-420 B. C., Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 1237 f.; Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 1173 f., *Hecuba*, 518 f.; 420-410 B. C., Euripides, *Hercules Furens*, 922 f., *Helen*, 1526 f.; 410-400 B. C., Thucydides, VI, 27-46; Euripides, *Bacchae*, 1043 f.; Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, 331 f. (331 is the first sentence of the speech which begins at 343), *Oedipus Coloneus*, 1586 f.; 400-390 B. C. (?), *Rhesus*, 756 f.; Lysias, VI, 1-22, XIII, 1-62; Isocrates, XVI, 1-37; 390-380 B. C., Isocrates, XIII; Isaeus, V, 1-24; Lysias, X, 1-29; Lysias, XXII; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I, ii, 38-47; II, vii, 1-12; 380-370 B. C., Plato, *Republic*, 401b-404d, 614b-621d; Isaeus, VIII, 1-27; 370-360 B. C., Isocrates, IX, 1-30, 47-81; Demosthenes, XXVII, 1-57; 360-350 B. C., Isaeus, XI, 1-26; Demosthenes, IV, 1-19, 40-51; Xenophon, *Hellenica*, I, 1-32; Plato, *Laws*, 624a-631b; 350-340 B. C., Demosthenes, V; VII, 1-37; XI; Aeschines, II, 1-29; 340-330 B. C., Isocrates, XII, 1-53; Hyperides, I; 330-320 B. C., Lycurgus, *Leocrates*, 1-26; Aeschines, III, 1-28; Demosthenes, XVIII, 1-35; XVII; Hyperides, IV, 1-30, VI, 1-42; Dinarchus, I, 1-47.

<sup>2</sup> Described in detail in *Studies presented to M. K. Pope* (Manchester University Press), p. 381.

struction are I. *length of sentence*, reckoned in grammatical terms, i. e. omitting prepositions, articles, and all but connective particles, II. *expansion*: the expansion of a simple grammatical term, subject or object or noun used adverbially, by adjectives, participles introduced by the article, etc.,<sup>3</sup> and the expansion of phrase, clause, or sentence by another like member connected with it by "and," III. *hypotactic organisation*: the system of clauses and appositions which depend upon the main sentence, IV. *paratactic organisation*: the arrangement of sentences, clauses, and phrases in pairs, triads, etc. in such a way that the first member of the group suggests that at least one other member is to follow, V. the combination of these two kinds of organisation into well-marked *sentence types*. If it can be proved that the variation of these essential features is not haphazard but shows some signs of regular chronological development and within that of personal preference (which may be sufficiently strong to serve as a criterion in distinguishing genuine from spurious), this study will have served its purpose.

### I. LENGTH.

The length of the sentence tends to increase. In the fifth century there is a more or less regular rise from Aeschylus' *Supplices* (14) to a peak in Sophocles' *Electra* (27). The *Agamemnon*, *Prometheus*, *Ajax*, and *Antigone* have slightly longer sentences than Herodotus; the excess is probably due to the forward rhythm of verse. Later messenger speeches come under the influence of the periodic structure of contemporary prose; Sophocles' sentences increase from 17 terms in the *Antigone* to 27 in the *Electra*, and Euripides' from 21.5 in the *Medea* to 25.5 in the *Bacchae*. No fifth century passage exceeds 27, and, if the tendency of verse to exceed prose be remembered, it seems probable that the usual length of prose sentences in the late fifth century is about 22 terms. In the fourth century, although the general trend is upwards and there is a rise from

<sup>3</sup> E. g., Demosthenes, IV, 17, "against these sudden expeditions of his from his own country against Pylae." A noun used adverbially, "expeditions," is expanded by adjective "these," adverb "sudden," noun used as adjective "of his," noun used adverbially "from country" (itself expanded by adjective "his own"), and noun used adverbially "against Pylae."



Lysias through Isaeus to Demosthenes, the variation between different authors is more marked. While the length of Demosthenes' sentences rises to 38 in the *Crown*, Aeschines, Hyperides, and Lycurgus average a little more or less than 30. Plato<sup>4</sup> and Xenophon write sentences which are little longer than those of Herodotus. The fashion for longer sentences may have been set by Isocrates since his earliest speeches average 33 and 37.5 and his last speech 46; he is followed by the writer of Demosthenes XI (47.5) and Dinarchus.

## II. EXPANSION.

The expansion of a single grammatical term into a phrase of two or more words, which yet does not contain a clause or opposition, may be called amplification. The number of amplifications varies in different passages between 83 and 227 per thousand terms. No clear development can be observed but the high and low points are interesting. Homer's epic style with its standing epithets has far less amplification than the "magnificent style" of Aeschylus<sup>5</sup> and than a good many fourth century speeches. Herodotus and Thucydides are well below the level of the tragedians. The narrative passages of both Plato and Xenophon have more amplification than the dialogue (146 and 115 contrasted with 96 and 83). In the orators two lines can be traced: Lysias, Isaeus, Demosthenes, and Hyperides<sup>6</sup> have a low number, Isocrates has a high number, and Lycurgus and Dinarchus a very high number; Dinarchus indeed has more amplifications than Aeschylus.

The second form of expansion may be called "linking." The writer links sentence to sentence, clause to clause, or word to word by "and," without having given any hint at the beginning

<sup>4</sup> The short answers bring the average in *Republic*, III down to 13.7, lower than Homer. In the *Myth of Er* the sentences average 25.

<sup>5</sup> The figures for individual messenger speeches must not be regarded as a certain guide because they contain so few sentences: but note that Aeschylus shows a steady decrease from the *Supplices* (227) to the *Prometheus* (172). Sophocles is steady except for two peaks, the *Antigone* (171) and the *Electra* (178)—due perhaps to the remainder of Aeschylean magnificence in the one and the deliberately heightened colouring of the Chariot Race in the other.

<sup>6</sup> The two law court speeches have each 125; the average is raised by the more formal *Funeral Speech* which has 160.

that more was to come. The total number of links tends to increase as sentences grow longer. Again the dialogue passages of Plato and Xenophon, which have short sentences and few amplifications (in which linked phrases may occur), present a marked contrast with the narrative passages, which are both rather fuller and looser and therefore have more links than the carefully formed and nervous narrative of Herodotus. Lysias and Isaeus have a smaller total of links than the other orators, but the blown-out sentences of Dinarchus have far more than anyone else.

The figures for linked sentences (i. e. main sentences linked together within a larger sentence) do not correspond exactly with the total figures for links: they are more frequent in the simpler narratives of Homer, Euripides, Xenophon, and Plato than in the more stylised narratives of Herodotus and the other tragedians. Aeschines has a higher proportion than the other orators; his sentences move more carelessly than theirs.

### III. HYPOTACTIC ORGANISATION.

The two main forms of subordination by which a sentence or phrase is made dependent on the main sentence are the clause and the apposition. The relation (substantival, adjectival, or adverbial) in which a clause stands to the main sentence is made clear either by the introducing conjunction or, in the case of some object clauses, by the use of infinitive or participle instead of main verb. In an apposition, whether an added nominal or participial phrase, or a sentence in parenthesis or connected by a particle,<sup>7</sup> the relation is less clear and the hearer may be left to choose whether he will interpret the subsidiary facts as cause or condition of the chief event.

The number of clauses in a thousand grammatical terms rises, but not uniformly. The difference between Homer and the three early plays of Aeschylus is imperceptible. From the time of the *Agamemnon* (76) a higher number is common; the figures for the *Prometheus* (97), *Trachinia* (106), *Oedipus Tyrannus* (85), *Philoctetes* (95), and *Oedipus Coloneus* (96) compare well with those of Herodotus and Thucydides. But, whereas the

<sup>7</sup> Even sentences added by γὰρ seem to me less clearly connected and subordinate than clauses introduced by ἐπει or participles introduced by ὡς or ἄτε.

figure of 90 is not common in the fifth century passages, a figure below 90 is rare in the fourth century.<sup>8</sup> Lysias, Isaeus, and Demosthenes have more than 100 clauses in all their speeches, and Lysias leads as befits his clarity.

The distribution of appositions differs from that of clauses; they are more common in the fifth century than in the fourth. In the fourth century Xenophon has more than other authors. The high number in the *Memorabilia* is partly due to vocatives and interpolated verbs of "saying." In the *Hellenica* Xenophon is writing in a narrative tradition which goes back to the messenger speeches of Sophocles and Euripides. The narrative of Homer and of the *Myth of Er* (74) have rather fewer appositions, and the carefully stylised narrative of Herodotus fewer still.

Hypotactic organisation means the combination of clauses and appositions into elaborate structures which depend on the main sentence. A simple instance is the sentence:<sup>9</sup> "I think therefore that I am able to say this, although I do not prevent anyone else from making a statement": the object of "I think" is the clause "that I am able," and the object of "I am able" is the clause "to say this"; similarly the sentence ends with a clause dependent on a participle in apposition. This sentence may be said to reach the first degree of complication (clause dependent on clause or apposition), and the next section of the table shows what percentage of sentences in each author reaches one, two, or more degrees of complication.

The number of sentences which have no such complication (i. e. which contain at most simple clauses and appositions) rises slightly from Homer to the *Supplices* (86) and *Persae* (84), and then falls.<sup>10</sup> Herodotus and the early plays of Sophocles are below the average of Aeschylus.<sup>11</sup> Euripides shows a steady decrease from 70% in the *Medea* to 35% in the *Bacchae*—a proportion which compares well with Sophocles' later plays and Thucydides. It is roughly true to say that in the early fifth

<sup>8</sup> The exceptions are Xenophon, *Hellenica* (65) (the *Memorabilia* is much higher [124]) and Plato, *Myth of Er* (65).

<sup>9</sup> Demosthenes, IV, 15.

<sup>10</sup> The *Prometheus Vinctus* falls right out of the picture: in fact so low a percentage (38.5) does not occur again until Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (33).

<sup>11</sup> The *Trachiniae* (50) and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (46.5) far below.

century the proportion sinks from 80% to 60%, and in the later fifth century from 60% to 40%. The figure in the fourth century is seldom above 40%<sup>12</sup> and often below 30%. In Lysias, Isaeus, and Demosthenes the general tendency is towards greater complication, and the normal number of simple sentences decreases from about 40% to about 20%. There is something of a swing back towards a level of 30% in the later part of the century, as can be seen by looking at the figures for Aeschines, Hyperides, Lycurgus, and Dinarchus.

The total number of complicated sentences (in the next line of the table) is the complement of the total number of simple sentences, and need not be further discussed. Sentences which reach at least the second degree of complication are more common in the fourth century than in the fifth;<sup>13</sup> five passages<sup>14</sup> have more than 50% of their sentences rising to at least two degrees of complication. The number of fifth century sentences with higher degrees of complication is negligible.<sup>15</sup> All the fourth century passages contain sentences which reach at least to the third degree except Plato, *Republic*, III, but the proportion varies from below 10% to over 29%.<sup>16</sup> In the fifth century only Herodotus, Thucydides, and Sophocles (in the *O. C.*) have sentences which rise to the fourth degree of complication, and no sentences go higher. In the fourth century a few sentences go up to the sixth degree, but, although all the fourth century

<sup>12</sup> Xenophon has 48% of simple sentences in the *Hellenica* and 40% in the *Memorabilia*; Plato's dialogues are near enough to ordinary speech to have a far higher number, 82% and 58% in *Republic*, III and X and 57% in the *Laws*. The proportion in Isocrates is very low except in the *Evagoras* (45) where the simpler epistolary form may have had some influence on the style.

<sup>13</sup> The *Prometheus* (31.5) and *Trachiniae* (25) stand out in the early part of the fifth century; Thucydides, *Philoctetes* (42), and *Oedipus Coloneus* (26) in the later part.

<sup>14</sup> Isocrates XIII (62), Lysias XXII (54), Isocrates XII (56), Hyperides I (58), and Demosthenes XVIII (60).

<sup>15</sup> Except in the *Agamemnon* (17) (due to the curious contorted sentences in the Herald's speech), the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (9), Thucydides, the Sophoclean *Electra* (13.5), and the *Oedipus Coloneus* (10).

<sup>16</sup> Below ten in the *Hellenica*, *Myth of Er*, Isaeus V, Demosthenes XXVII, Isocrates IX, and Hyperides IV. The highest percentages (29 and over) belong to Isocrates XIII, XII, Hyperides I, Demosthenes XVIII and XI.

passages<sup>17</sup> have some sentences which go at least to the fourth degree, in only a few passages<sup>18</sup> do such sentences make up more than 10% of the whole. The general level of complication is higher in the later part of the fourth century, but there is great variation between individual passages.

#### IV. PARATACTIC ORGANISATION.

The grouping of sentences, clauses, or words in pairs or triads<sup>19</sup> becomes more common from the later years of the fifth century onwards.<sup>20</sup> Until the *Medea* the number is usually lower than 40 pairs per thousand grammatical terms; from the *Medea* to the end of the century the number does not fall far below 50 and rises to nearly 60 in Sophocles' *Electra*, Euripides' *Bacchae*, and Thucydides. Something of the conscious grouping of contemporary orators has affected tragedy, and Thucydides has also felt their influence.

In the fourth century the boundary which divides the more from the less formal authors lies at about fifty pairs per thousand terms. Xenophon, Lysias, and Plato are below it;<sup>21</sup> Isaeus shows a gradual increase up to it; Demosthenes reaches the boundary only in the *Crown*. These rises may be due to the influence of Isocrates whose large number of pairs are evidence of his training by Gorgias. Of the later orators Aeschines is well below the boundary; Lycurgus, Hyperides, and Dinarchus are on it.

<sup>17</sup> Except Isocrates XVI, Isaeus V, Plato, *Republic*, III.

<sup>18</sup> They are Isocrates XIII (11%), Lysias XXII (10%), Demosthenes VII (12%), Isocrates XII (16%), Hyperides I (18%), Demosthenes XVIII (10%), XI (14%), Dinarchus (16%).

<sup>19</sup> Grouping with  $\mu\acute{e}v \dots \delta\acute{e}$ ,  $\tau\acute{e} \dots kai$ ,  $\acute{o}\nu\kappa \dots \acute{a}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ , etc. I include also anaphora, asyndeton, rhetorical question and answer.

<sup>20</sup> The *Agamemnon* has more (56) than the other early tragedies, and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* soars above the whole series although the figure (88) is undoubtedly exaggerated because based on such a small number of terms.

<sup>21</sup> Xenophon's *Hellenica* (33) is below the boundary (indeed, it is less formal than Herodotus), whereas the *Memorabilia* (62) has some of the tricks of Sophistic phrasing. The high proportion of pairs (55.5) in Lysias VI is an argument against its genuineness. Plato rises above the boundary only in the *Myth of Er*, and that is partly due to the amount of grouping necessitated by the subject.

Whether the pairs are pairs of sentences, clauses (or parts of clauses), or phrases depends on the taste of the author<sup>22</sup> and has little or no chronological significance. But progress can be seen in the percentage of sentences containing several pairs. The number of sentences with at least one pair is strikingly higher from the time of the *Medea* onwards.<sup>23</sup> The number of sentences with at least two pairs also increases with the *Medea*, and increases again in the second half of the fourth century.<sup>24</sup> The percentage of sentences with at least three pairs is rather lower, but the high numbers and low numbers occur in the same authors and passages. Of the fifth century passages only the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and Thucydides have sentences with four pairs; but four pairs are common in the fourth century.<sup>25</sup> Only Isocrates, Thucydides, Demosthenes XI, and Dinarchus have more than four sentences which contain five pairs. Sentences containing six or seven pairs are naturally still rarer, and sentences containing more than seven pairs are confined to Thucydides, Isocrates XVI, IX and XII, Lysias X, Plato (*Republic*, III), Aeschines III, and Dinarchus. Thus Thucydides for us is the herald of this very distinctive feature of fourth century prose.

## V. TYPES OF SENTENCE.

Sentences vary in type according as they are hypotactically or paratactically organised (or both or neither). The main lines of classification have been laid down by Aristotle.<sup>26</sup> First, there

<sup>22</sup> The proportion of paired sentences is very high in Homer and Euripides and high in Aeschylus and Sophocles; low in Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Lycurgus. The proportion of paired phrases is very high in Plato and high in Lycurgus.

<sup>23</sup> Before that only the *Agamemnon* and *Prometheus* have a large percentage (60, 62); after that only Xenophon's *Hellenica* and Plato (dialogue passages) have a notably small proportion (36, 27, 40%).

<sup>24</sup> The notable peaks are the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (72%), Thucydides, and the *Oedipus Coloneus* (42%) in the fifth century, and in the fourth Isocrates (except *Evagoras*), Demosthenes XVIII (56%), the First speech of Hyperides (46%), and Dinarchus.

<sup>25</sup> The exceptions are Lysias VI and XXII. High numbers occur in Isocrates XIII, IX, XII, Demosthenes XI, XVIII, and Dinarchus.

<sup>26</sup> *Studies presented to M. K. Pope*, p. 387. Zehetmeier, *Periodenlehre*, restricts Aristotle's meaning too much when he explains his statement by rhythm alone.

are Simple sentences with at most simple clauses and appositions and Complicated sentences with at least one clause or apposition dependent on a clause or apposition; then these two main types are varied by the introduction of paired sentences, paired clauses, etc. The normal types of Simple sentences are simple single sentences (I. a. 1), simple single sentences with subdivision (I. b. 1), and simple double (paired) sentences (II. 1). Complicated sentences can be subdivided into single complicated sentences with no subdivision<sup>27</sup> (I. a. 2, etc.), divided and complicated sentences (I. b. 2, etc.), and double complicated sentences (II. 2, etc.). In addition there is a small class of triple and higher sentences, which may or may not be complicated or further subdivided (III, etc.).

#### a. *Simple sentences.*

The simple single sentence (I. a. 1) becomes gradually less common. The percentage varies between 60% and 40% from Homer to Herodotus.<sup>28</sup> After Herodotus the fifth century passages have a varying proportion with a maximum of 29% in Thucydides.<sup>29</sup> Thucydides may represent the normal writing of his time better than the tragedians, because the more stylised narrative of tragedy often chooses divided and double sentences rather than single sentences. In the fourth century the proportion of simple single sentences lies between 20% and 10%.<sup>30</sup> The other normal types of simple sentence (I. b. 1 and II. 1) are both rather more common in the fifth than in the fourth century.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> A single paired phrase may be admitted.

<sup>28</sup> Only the *Prometheus Vinctus* and the *Ajax* are well below 40%.

<sup>29</sup> Except for the *Helen* which has none, Euripides has a rather higher average than Sophocles.

<sup>30</sup> The exceptions are Xenophon, Lysias XIII, and Plato, which are above the normal, and Isocrates XVI, XII, and Demosthenes XVIII, which are below the normal.

<sup>31</sup> The single divided sentence rises above 10% only in the *Supplices*, the *Agamemnon*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Helen*, the *Oedipus Coloneus*, Lysias VI, Plato, *Myth*, and Isocrates IX. The double simple sentence rises to over 20% in the *Ajax* and *Trachiniae* and over 10% in all the tragedies except the *Agamemnon*, *Medea*, *O. T.*, *Philoctetes*, and *Helen*. In the fourth century Lysias VI, Isaeus V, and Hyperides VI have more than 10%.

b. *Complicated sentences.*i. *Single complicated sentences.*

The single complicated sentence is unevenly distributed and no clear trend<sup>32</sup> can be traced; the general level is somewhat over 10%. There are two chief types. In the more common (I. a. 2) a single simple clause or apposition is the basis for the further dependent clauses.<sup>33</sup> In the rarer kind (I. a. 4) two (or very occasionally more) simple clauses form the bases for further dependent clauses. This second kind does not occur in the passages from Homer, Euripides, and Demosthenes XI; it is on the whole more common in the fourth century than in the fifth.<sup>34</sup>

In all authors except Lysias the majority of sentences with a single complication (I. a. 2) are not complicated beyond the first degree, though in Demosthenes and Isaeus only slightly less than half reach a higher degree. Aeschylus and Thucydides alone of fifth century authors have sentences of this type reaching the third degree of complication. Aeschines and Demosthenes VII and XI alone reach the fifth degree of complication. Sentences of this type with paired phrases are not common except in Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, Euripides, Xenophon, and Aeschines.

The sentences with two complications (I. a. 4) are a tiny group. In Lysias and Isaeus some of them reach the fourth degree of complication, in Demosthenes they reach the third. Hyperides has one with seven degrees of complication.

<sup>32</sup> The notably high points are the *Prometheus Vinctus*, the three early plays of Sophocles, Xenophon, particularly the *Hellenica*, Lysias XXII, and lastly Demosthenes IV, V and Aeschines II.

<sup>33</sup> E. g. Herodotus, III, 24, 1, "After that they finally saw their tombs which are said to be made of glass in the following manner."

<sup>34</sup> In Aeschylus, Sophocles, Herodotus, Xenophon, and Isocrates (who always builds his more complicated sentences with pairs) less than a tenth of the total number of single complicated sentences; in Thucydides, Lysias (XIII has more than the rest), Plato (who uses this form only in the *Laws*), Lycurgus, Aeschines between 15% and 18% of the total; in Isaeus (who has most in the earliest speech), Demosthenes (who has a very high proportion in the *Crown*), Hyperides (who has most in IV), and Dinarchus between 20% and 26%. Lysias VI has the freak proportion of 44%. An example from Demosthenes is given above, note 9.

ii. *Single divided and complicated sentences.*

The divided and complicated single sentences increase in number through the period. No passage before Herodotus contains more than 10% of such sentences; Herodotus has 14% and Thucydides 21%.<sup>35</sup> In the fourth century the 20% level is common and in several passages 30% or even 40% of the sentences have this form.<sup>36</sup> There are four main groups. In the first (I. b. 2; 3) the division occurs in the main sentence or in a simple clause or apposition; one or both of the limbs of the division are complicated but there is no other complication of the main sentence. Thucydides (VI, 44, 3) provides a simple example: "they said they would side with *neither* BUT would do whatever was agreed on by the other Italiots." This group does not occur in Homer or Aeschylus, and in other authors accounts for varying numbers between a fifth (Aeschines) and three-fifths (Isaeus) of the divided complicated sentences.<sup>37</sup> In many passages the sentences of this type with one complicated limb (I. b. 2) and two complicated limbs (I. b. 3) are equal in number, but in Isocrates, Plato, and Hyperides the two complicated limbs are more common, and in Thucydides, Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and Aeschines the single complicated limb predominates. Neither is used for sentences of great complexity,<sup>38</sup> and the

<sup>35</sup> The *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Hippolytus* have approximately the same number as Herodotus. The *Helen*, and Sophocles' *Electra*, *Philoctetes*, and *Oedipus Coloneus* have numbers in the neighbourhood of 20%.

<sup>36</sup> Isocrates XII and IX, Lysias X, Isaeus XI, and Hyperides VI have over 30%, Demosthenes VII, Lycurgus, and Demosthenes XVII have over 40%. Less than 20% are found in Lysias XIII, Isaeus V, Plato, *Republic*, III and *Laws*, Aeschines II, and Hyperides I.

<sup>37</sup> Lysias VI, Thucydides, Dinarchus, Demosthenes (the number in XVIII is below average), Lysias, Xenophon (this type occurs only in the *Memorabilia*), and Isocrates have between 25% and 35% of their totals for the group belonging to this type. Plato, Demosthenes (VII, XVII, XI), Hyperides, and Sophocles (only in the later plays) have between 40% and 43%. Isaeus, Lycurgus, Herodotus, and Euripides have between 50% and 60%.

<sup>38</sup> Thucydides, however, and Demosthenes XI have one of the first type (I. b. 2) and Plato and Lycurgus have each one of the second type (I. b. 3) which reaches the fourth degree of complication; in Demosthenes VII one sentence has one limb which reaches the fifth degree of complication.

majority of these sentences have only one pair (or division) and are not further subdivided.<sup>39</sup>

The second group is a small one and consists of sentences which have a single complication outside the division (I. b. 5).<sup>40</sup> Homer (H 117) gives an example: "If he is *both* fearless and if he is insatiate of toil, I say that he will gladly bend his knee, should he escape from fierce war and the bitterness of the foe." Not many sentences of this form have a high degree of complexity,<sup>41</sup> and except in Thucydides multiplication of pairs does not occur until the fourth century, when two pairs at least are common.<sup>42</sup>

The third group (I. b. 6) in which the bifurcation develops out of the complication is a much larger one, and in the majority of authors<sup>43</sup> accounts for more than 30% of the complicated divided sentences. It is illustrated by Plato (*Republic*, 614d): "as he himself came up, he said that he must be a messenger to men of things there, and that they ordered him *both* to hear and to see everything in that place." From the time of Sophocles

<sup>39</sup> Thucydides, Plato, and Isocrates are notable exceptions: Thucydides has two sentences with three pairs and one sentence with six. Plato has four sentences with two pairs, one with three, and two with four. Isocrates has six with two pairs, two with three pairs, and one with four pairs.

<sup>40</sup> This type does not occur in Herodotus and accounts for 7% or less of the complicated divided sentences in Isocrates, Sophocles, Demosthenes (VII, XVII, XI); 9% to 15% Aeschines, Dinarchus, Plato, Lysias VI, Isaeus, and Xenophon (*Hellenica* only); 19% to 23% in Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Hyperides (most are in VI), and Lysias; 27% to 30% in Thucydides, Euripides, and Homer; 42% in Aeschylus.

<sup>41</sup> One in the passage from the *Prometheus Vinctus*, one in Thucydides, one in Lysias, one in Isocrates, two in Isaeus, two in Demosthenes, one in Hyperides, and two in Dinarchus reach the third degree of complication; one in Demosthenes reaches the fourth degree.

<sup>42</sup> Lysias and Isaeus have each one sentence with three pairs; Plato has one with four and one with six; Lycurgus has one with five, and Dinarchus one with four pairs.

<sup>43</sup> Euripides has only 10% of this type (and they are only in the *Helen* and *Bacchae*); Isaeus, Lycurgus, and Plato between 16% and 22%; Hyperides (most are in VI), Thucydides, Sophocles (mostly in the early plays), Xenophon, Demosthenes (XXVII has less than the average), and Lysias between 25% and 33%; Demosthenes (VII, XVIII, XI), Herodotus, and Isocrates between 38% and 46%; Aeschines, Dinarchus, Aeschylus, Homer, and Lysias VI range from 52% to 63%.

there are many highly complicated sentences and many sentences with considerable further subdivision belonging to this group.<sup>44</sup>

The fourth group (I. b. 6a) is again a small one; it consists of sentences which have an extra complication in addition to the complication which develops into a bifurcation.<sup>45</sup> Aeschylus, Herodotus, Euripides, and the author of Lysias VI have no examples; and only five authors, Sophocles, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Aeschines have as many as a fifth of their divided and complicated sentences moulded to this shape. Thucydides anticipates fourth century usage,<sup>46</sup> because his sentences reach the third and fourth degree of complication and two of the four have two extra pairs.

" Sophocles has two sentences which reach the third degree of complication and one which reaches the fourth, and three sentences containing two pairs and one containing three pairs. Herodotus has one sentence with three degrees of complication and one with four, but only one sentence with two pairs. Thucydides' sentences mostly reach only the second degree, but he has one with two pairs, one with three pairs, and one with six pairs. Lysias has one sentence with four degrees of complication, two with five degrees, and one with six degrees: a third of his sentences of this type have two pairs but none more. In Isocrates the majority of the sentences reach only the second degree of complication: four reach the third, one the fourth, and one the fifth: three sentences have three pairs, one has five pairs, and one has seven pairs. Isaeus has one sentence of the sixth degree of complication and one sentence with four pairs. Plato has three sentences with three degrees of complication, two with four, and one with six; three sentences with three pairs and one with five. Demosthenes' sentences show no great decrease in number from the first to the fifth degree of complication; only one reaches the sixth; the majority have two pairs, three have three pairs, and none more. Of the other orators Dinarchus is noteworthy in that his sentences range from one to nine degrees of complication and from one to eleven pairs.

<sup>45</sup> E. g. Thucydides, VI, 36, 4.

<sup>46</sup> One of Lysias' sentences reaches the sixth degree of complication and one has four pairs. Half of Isocrates' sentences are complicated to the third and fourth degree, and he has sentences of this type with three, four, seven, and even twelve pairs. Isaeus has no sentence with more than three degrees of complication or more than four pairs. One of Plato's sentences has four degrees of complication and one has seven pairs. The other orators with the exception of Lycurgus have sentences up to the fourth degree of complication; none has more than four pairs except a single sentence of Dinarchus which has six.

iii. *Double complicated sentences.*

The double complicated sentences also increase, though not so regularly. Less than a fifth of the sentences in the early plays of Sophocles and in Herodotus are of this type.<sup>47</sup> After the *Medea* 30% is common and under 20% very rare;<sup>48</sup> and in the fourth century some passages, such as Isocrates XIII, Demosthenes XI, XVIII, XXVII, have more than 40% of their sentences so formed.<sup>49</sup>

The type can be subdivided into sentences which have or have not further bifurcation of sentences or clauses. In general the sentences with further subdivision are more common than those without. The exceptions are Herodotus, Lysias, and Lycurgus; in the other passages the proportions vary from Thucydides who has 6% only of undivided sentences to Euripides with 43%.<sup>50</sup>

The undivided sentences<sup>51</sup> sometimes have both sentences and sometimes only one complicated. The latter (II. 2) is the more usual in all authors. The type with both sentences complicated (II. 5) does not occur in the passages from Homer, Aeschylus, and Xenophon and only reaches considerable proportions in Euripides, Lysias, Isaeus, and Demosthenes.<sup>52</sup>

The divided sentences fall under three headings: pairs of sentences with one sentence subdivided (II. 2a), pairs with the second sentence bifurcated and further bifurcated (II. 3), and pairs with both sentences bifurcated (II. 4). The first kind is the most common, the second comes next, and the third is the

<sup>47</sup> But *Agamemnon* and *Prometheus* have over 20%.

<sup>48</sup> Thucydides and Sophocles' *Electra* have less than 20%. The *Oedipus Tyrannus* has over 40% and the *Hecuba* and *Bacchae* over 30%.

<sup>49</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenica*, Plato, Aeschines II, and Lycurgus have less than 20%. Isocrates XVI, IX, XII, Hyperides I, and Dinarchus have well above 30%.

<sup>50</sup> Sophocles, Xenophon, Isaeus, Plato, and Hyperides have between 30% and 35%; Isocrates, Aeschines, Homer, and Dinarchus between 20% and 26%; Aeschylus 39%; Demosthenes 40%.

<sup>51</sup> They may, of course, admit small paired phrases.

<sup>52</sup> None of these sentences reaches above the second degree of complication except one in Isocrates and three in Demosthenes. The type with one complicated sentence (II. 2) reaches the fourth degree of complication in Isocrates, Plato, Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus. Paired phrases are not common in either type: Demosthenes has one sentence of each with three paired phrases.

rarest. The first<sup>53</sup> occurs in all passages and except in Thucydides, Xenophon, Lysias, and Hyperides accounts for more than half of the subdivided double sentences. The second<sup>54</sup> does not occur in Homer, Herodotus, or Lycurgus; it is rare in Euripides and Plato, but common in Aeschylus, Thucydides, and Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. The third type<sup>55</sup> does not occur in Aeschylus, Herodotus, Thucydides, or Lycurgus; only Homer, Plato, and Demosthenes have as many as a third of their divided double sentences with both sentences subdivided.

### c. Triple and higher sentences.

Triple sentences are never common and in few passages reach more than 10% of the total number.<sup>56</sup> Sentences can be com-

<sup>53</sup> A considerable number of sentences of the first type (II. 2a) have no complication at all and these occur in all authors except Lysias and Lycurgus: they make up over half the examples in Herodotus and Euripides, and about a quarter of those in Sophocles, Isocrates, Plato, and Aeschines. Except for a single sentence in Aeschylus, only Isocrates, Plato, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aeschines, and Dinarchus have sentences of this type which go beyond the second degree of complication. Sentences with more than three pairs occur only in Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Plato.

<sup>54</sup> In these sentences, which have a divided and further subdivided second sentence (II. 3), there is also sometimes no complication; a third of Isocrates' total is of this type. More commonly, however, there is at least one degree of complication. Sophocles, Xenophon, and Isocrates have sentences with four degrees of complication; Dinarchus reaches the fifth degree, and Hyperides the sixth. Multiplication of pairs is to be expected; Thucydides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and the author of Demosthenes XI all have sentences with six pairs; Thucydides has one sentence with ten pairs.

<sup>55</sup> In the third type (II. 4) both sentences are subdivided; sentences without complication are found in Euripides, Lysias, Plato (4 out of 5), Demosthenes, and Dinarchus. Only the fourth century authors go beyond the first degree of complication. Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, and Demosthenes all have sentences which reach the third degree of complication; Isocrates and Demosthenes go beyond to the fourth degree. The fourth century authors also have more than the necessary minimum of three pairs. Xenophon, Isaeus, and Demosthenes all have sentences of this type with six pairs; Lysias and Plato have sentences with nine pairs. Aeschines has one with eleven pairs and Isocrates one with twelve pairs.

<sup>56</sup> The *Medea* has over 20%: the *Electra* and *Bacchae* also have over 20%.

posed of yet more parallel members. Quadruple sentences occur in Sophocles and Isocrates, quintuple sentences in Isocrates and Hyperides. Isocrates has one set of six parallel sentences, and Plato batches of seven and eight. Many of these sets of sentences have no complication;<sup>57</sup> further subdivision is not uncommon but seldom exceeds two further sets of pairs (or higher groupings).<sup>58</sup>

## VI. AUTHORS.

It should now be possible to give some picture of the methods used by different authors in constructing sentences. Homer's sentence construction is already advanced. His sentences are little shorter than those of Herodotus. He has fewer amplifications than the tragedians (his epic style is not so distended as theirs); but in his simple narrative the number of linked sentences is very high. The number of his clauses is small but can be paralleled in the tragic passages; appositions are frequent, well above the fourth century level: they are able to express without explicit connection the simple Homeric thought relations. Only a quarter of Homer's sentences are complicated; only six sentences reach the second degree, and only one the third. Homer has fewer pairs than any other author and a very high proportion of them are in sentences. The dominant sentence type is I. a. 1.<sup>59</sup> Of the complicated types I. a. 2 is the commonest and after that the divided complicated group; four of these belong to type I. b. 6, and one reaches the third degree of complication and has two pairs. Homer is a simple author but in such sentences and in the isolated examples of I. b. 5, I. b. 6a, and II. 4 lie the possibilities of future development.

Aeschylus has many amplifications because his style is "mag-

<sup>57</sup> Euripides has one triplet with four degrees of complication, Lysias one with three degrees and one with five degrees; Demosthenes and Dinarchus also have sentences of this type with three degrees of complication.

<sup>58</sup> Thucydides has two triple sentences with three further pairs, and one with five; Isocrates, Hyperides, and Dinarchus have each one sentence with five further pairs, and Demosthenes one with four.

<sup>59</sup> Of the other simple types the double simple sentence (II. 1) is much more common and accounts for 11% of the total; to these should be added two simple sentences of the type with further subdivision (II. 2a).

nificent." He has not a large number of clauses (they increase in the later plays), nor does he use many appositions. Three-quarters of his sentences have no complication, but slightly more reach the second and third degree than in Homer. Except in the *Agamemnon* he has few pairs. Nearly half the total number of sentences belong to type I. a. 1.<sup>60</sup> The largest number of complicated sentences belong to type I. a. 2. The rest are divided between I. b. 5, I. b. 6, II. 2, II. 2a,<sup>61</sup> II. 3, and III.<sup>62</sup> Aeschylus' style becomes less padded and more highly organised as he proceeds. The *Prometheus Vinctus*<sup>63</sup> differs from the other plays, and its sentence construction would repay study on a larger scale.

Sophocles writes longer sentences than Aeschylus, particularly in his later plays, and has fewer amplifications. He has nearly as many clauses as Herodotus and more appositions than any other author. Less than half of his sentences have no complication and in number of sentences which reach the second, third, and fourth degree of complication he stands between Herodotus and Thucydides. The number of pairs is low in the three early plays, but alone of the tragedians he has sentences containing four pairs. Sentences of types I. b. 2, I. b. 3, and II. 5 appear for the first time. Simple single sentences (I. a. 1) make up a fifth of the whole.<sup>64</sup> Sophocles has twice as many complicated

<sup>60</sup> Simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1) make up almost another quarter; in addition one of type II. 2a, two of type II. 3, and four of his five triple sentences have no complication.

<sup>61</sup> One reaches the third degree of complication.

<sup>62</sup> The complicated sentences seldom have extra pairs: the exceptions are two of class I. a. 2, each with a pair of phrases, one of class II. 2a with an extra pair, and one triple sentence with two extra pairs.

<sup>63</sup> The two single complicated sentences with a pair of phrases are both in the *Prometheus*. This play also has a complicated divided sentence of class I. b. 5 which reaches the third degree of complication. In other ways also the *Prometheus* stands rather apart. It has many more clauses than the other plays and a much lower percentage of sentences without complication. It has also a higher percentage of linked sentences, clauses, and phrases. Simple single sentences are less numerous, complicated sentences far more numerous than in any other play: complicated double sentences very nearly reach the high number in the *Agamemnon*.

<sup>64</sup> Another fifth is made up of simple single divided sentences (I. b. 1) and double simple sentences (II. 1), which last are commonest in the

divided and double sentences as Aeschylus, and both are more common in the later plays than in the earlier. His favorite types are I. b. 6, II. 2, and II. 2a, which together make 20% of his sentences.<sup>65</sup> Sophocles does not reach great elaboration in complication or subdivision, but his clear and orderly sentences show a variety of structure which looks forward to writers like Lysias.

Euripides' sentences have the same length and the same number of amplifications, but he has more links and more than twice as many linked sentences. He has fewer appositions and far fewer clauses. Over half of his sentences have no complication, and only one sentence reaches the third and fourth degree of complication. Three-quarters of his pairs are in sentences; and fewer sentences contain three pairs than in Sophocles. Euripides has rather more simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and rather fewer single simple sentences (I. a. 1).<sup>66</sup> He has fewer of type I. a. 2<sup>67</sup> and fewer complicated divided sentences, of which only two reach the second degree of complication.<sup>68</sup> He has more complicated double sentences, having considerably more of types II. 2 and II. 2a,<sup>69</sup> and more triple sentences, about half of them complicated. Euripides' writing is simple and his sentences more stereotyped than those of Sophocles. He eschews both much complication and many pairs. The *Rhesus*<sup>70</sup> mes-

early plays: the few remaining simple sentences belong to types II. 2a, III, and IV.

<sup>65</sup> Of the six examples of I. b. 6, two reach the third degree of complication and one the fourth; three contain two pairs and one contains three pairs. The four examples of II. 2 reach only the first degree and have no further pairs. One of the nine examples of II. 2a reaches the second degree of complication, and three have an extra pair. One of the three examples of II. 3 reaches the fourth degree of complication, and one has an extra pair.

<sup>66</sup> To 40% of I. a. 1, I. b. 1, II. 1 must be added another 15% composed of simple sentences of types II. 2a, II. 3, II. 4, and III.

<sup>67</sup> Only one of them reaches the second degree of complication; unlike Sophocles he has paired phrases in four of them.

<sup>68</sup> Type I. b. 6 provides only two examples, one of which contains an extra pair; types I. b. 2, 3, 5 are more common than in Sophocles.

<sup>69</sup> One-third of these have no complication of clauses or appositions; one-seventh reach the second degree of complication; one-eighth have extra pairs.

<sup>70</sup> The *Rhesus* differs from the average performances of all three tragedians. In length of sentences, number of pairs, and appositions

senger speech in some respects stands by itself, and it would be interesting to examine its sentence construction more fully.

Four prose authors may now be considered together: Herodotus and Thucydides, Xenophon (historian in the *Hellenica*, writer of dialogue in the *Memorabilia*), and Plato (writer of dialogue in *Republic*, III, and the *Laws*, writer of narrative in the *Myth of Er*).

Herodotus' sentences have the same length as Aeschylus'; he has fewer amplifications than the poets and fewer links than any other author. He has more clauses and fewer appositions than Sophocles. He has slightly more complicated sentences than Aeschylus; one reaches the fourth degree of complication. He has the same number of pairs as Aeschylus and a similar distribution of pairs in his sentences. The number of simple single sentences (I. a. 1) is the same as in Aeschylus.<sup>71</sup> Eleven sentences belong to type I. a. 2, and two of them go to the second degree of complication. Divided complicated sentences are as numerous as in Sophocles; they belong to types I. b. 2,<sup>72</sup> I. b. 3,<sup>73</sup> and I. b. 6.<sup>74</sup> Herodotus has few complicated double sentences, and uses only types II. 2, II. 5, and II. 2a;<sup>75</sup> his triple

the messenger speech agrees with both Sophocles and Euripides. The number of amplifications is lower than in any other play except the *Trachiniae*; but the number of linked sentences and the total number of links is far higher than in any other play. The number of clauses is higher than in any play of Euripides but below the Sophoclean average. The figures for sentences with and without complication agree most nearly with the *Bacchae*. All the pairs are in sentences, and no sentence has more than two pairs. The number of triads is nearer to Euripides than to Sophocles. The sentence types are very few; I. a. 1 and II. 1 account for about 40% of the whole; II. 2 and II. 2a make another 40%, the rest are III. No sentence has extra pairs.

<sup>71</sup> Simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1) together make up 16% (three simple sentences of type II. 2a make up the total of 63%).

<sup>72</sup> Three sentences, two of the second degree of complication and one with an extra pair.

<sup>73</sup> Five sentences, one of the third degree of complication and two with extra pairs.

<sup>74</sup> Six sentences, one of the fourth degree of complication and one with an extra pair.

<sup>75</sup> Only one sentence, which belongs to type II. 2a, reaches the second degree of complication; one sentence of type II. 2 and one of type II. 2a have an extra pair.

sentences are all complicated. Herodotus stands between Aeschylus and Sophocles, though his prose is leaner than their verse. He has not so many pairs as Sophocles in his later plays, nor are his sentence types so varied, but he is not a simple writer as Pherecydes and Hecataeus were simple.

Thucydides has been more influenced by the style of the sophists. His sentences are as long as those in contemporary tragedy. His is a fuller prose than Herodotus', with more amplifications and twice as many linked sentences. Clauses are more numerous and appositions less than in Herodotus. The number of complicated sentences is the same as Sophocles' average; but half as many again of Thucydides' sentences reach the second degree of complication or higher. He has more pairs than Sophocles and many more sentences with several pairs. Type I. a. 1 accounts for little more than a quarter of his sentences. Two of his single complicated sentences reach the third degree of complication. Unlike Sophocles and Euripides, he has more complicated divided than complicated double sentences; the total of both is the same as theirs. He uses type I. b. 3<sup>76</sup> less than I. b. 2, I. b. 5, I. b. 6, and I. b. 6a.<sup>77</sup> There is only one example of each of types II. 2 and II. 5; the other complicated double sentences are equally divided between II. 2a and II. 3.<sup>78</sup> Thucydides is more advanced than any of his predecessors partly because of his greater complication but still more because of his greater use of pairs and subdivision.

The two passages of Xenophon are written in different traditions, narrative and dialogue. His sentences are slightly longer than Herodotus'. The number of amplifications is rather greater in the *Hellenica* than in Thucydides; and lower in the *Memorabilia* than in any other passage. The number of linked sentences is very high in the *Hellenica* and very low in the *Memorabilia*; the total number of links is higher in the *Hellenica* than in any fifth

<sup>76</sup> Two examples, one containing six pairs.

<sup>77</sup> Sentences of types I. b. 2, I. b. 6, and I. b. 6a reach the fourth degree of complication and have two extra pairs. One sentence of I. b. 5 has five pairs, and one of I. b. 6 six pairs.

<sup>78</sup> Only three of the complicated double sentences reach the third degree of complication, but over half of the total have extra pairs. Sentences of type II. 3 have four, five, six, and even ten pairs. The triple sentences, of which three are complicated, have one, two, four, and six pairs or higher groupings.

century author and in the *Memorabilia* very low; the same contrast between dialogue and narrative can be observed in Plato. Clauses are few in the *Hellenica* and very frequent in the *Memorabilia*; appositions are as common in both as in the later tragedians. Both passages have more complicated sentences than Herodotus; the *Hellenica* agrees closely with Sophocles; the *Memorabilia* has fewer simple sentences and more of the higher complicated sentences than Thucydides. The *Hellenica* has fewer pairs than Herodotus, and the *Memorabilia* rather more than Thucydides; the distribution in both passages is more like Thucydides than Herodotus.<sup>79</sup> Simple single sentences (I. a. 1) are more numerous in both than in Thucydides.<sup>80</sup> Single complicated sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) are more numerous than in any fifth century passage (and more numerous in the *Memorabilia* than in any other passage).<sup>81</sup> The *Hellenica* has as many complicated divided sentences as Herodotus and the *Memorabilia* as many as Thucydides. The commonest type is I. b. 2 (*Memorabilia* only).<sup>82</sup> There are two examples of I. b. 5 (both in the *Hellenica*)<sup>83</sup> and five examples of I. b. 6.<sup>84</sup> Type II. 3 is the commonest of the complicated double sentences (6 sentences).<sup>85</sup> The general impression left by Xenophon is that he is a simple writer, less lean and economical than Herodotus, who has been affected by the general fourth century movement towards greater complication and subdivision, particularly in the *Memorabilia*.

The three passages of Plato come from a comparatively early

<sup>79</sup> In the *Hellenica* six sentences have three pairs and two have four; in the *Memorabilia* five sentences have five pairs and two have six.

<sup>80</sup> Types I. b. 1 and II. 1 add 8% in the *Hellenica* and 11% in the *Memorabilia*; there is also one example of II. 2a and one of II. 3 without complication.

<sup>81</sup> Half of these sentences reach the second degree of complication, and two in the *Memorabilia* reach the third.

<sup>82</sup> About half the examples (three out of seven) reach the second degree of complication, and one sentence has five pairs.

<sup>83</sup> Both reach the second degree of complication and one has an extra pair.

<sup>84</sup> One reaches the fifth degree of complication; two have an extra pair.

<sup>85</sup> It provides the only examples of the third and fourth degree of complication in this class; one sentence has an extra pair, and one two extra pairs. The single example of II. 4 reaches only the first degree of complication but has three extra pairs.

part of the *Republic*, from the *Myth of Er*, and from the *Laws*. The average length of the sentences is the same as in Xenophon.<sup>86</sup> The average number of amplifications is high<sup>87</sup> and as in Xenophon the narrative passage has many more links and in particular many more linked sentences. Plato has fewer clauses than Herodotus,<sup>88</sup> but appositions are numerous in the *Myth of Er*. The number of simple sentences is high because of the very high proportion in *Republic*, III (74%); complicated sentences are distributed much as in Herodotus, except that Plato has more sentences which reach the third and fourth degree and some sentences which reach the fifth and sixth.<sup>89</sup> Pairs are slightly commoner than in Xenophon, but nearly half of them are paired phrases;<sup>90</sup> the distribution of them in sentences is not unlike Xenophon's. Simple single sentences (I. a. 1) make nearly half the total of Plato's sentences.<sup>91</sup> Four-fifths of the single complicated sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) reach only the first degree of complication.<sup>92</sup> Plato has the same number of divided complicated sentences as Herodotus; type I. b. 6 predominates, otherwise the numbers are fairly even. This group contains twice as many highly complicated sentences<sup>93</sup> as the group of double complicated sentences, which is smaller in Plato than in any author since Aeschylus. His favorite types are II. 2<sup>94</sup> and

<sup>86</sup> But in detail the figures vary from 13.7 in *Republic*, III to 25 in *Myth of Er*.

<sup>87</sup> Although in *Republic*, III nearly as low as in the *Memorabilia*.

<sup>88</sup> The *Myth of Er* has the same low number as Xenophon's *Hellenica*.

<sup>89</sup> In the early passage of the *Republic* no sentence goes beyond the second degree of complication.

<sup>90</sup> The *Myth of Er* has more pairs per sentence than the dialogue passages.

<sup>91</sup> Simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1) add 13%; the remaining 4% of simple sentences is made up by uncomplicated sentences of types II. 2a, II. 4, III, VII, VIII.

<sup>92</sup> But one of type I. a. 2 reaches the fourth degree, and one of type I. a. 4 reaches the third degree; one of type I. a. 2 and two of type I. a. 4 have extra paired phrases.

<sup>93</sup> They belong to type I. b. 3 (to the fourth degree), type I. b. 6 (to the sixth degree), and type I. b. 6a (to the third degree). All the types have sentences with extra pairs, I. b. 2 and I. b. 6 with two extra, I. b. 3 with three, I. b. 5 with five, and I. b. 6a with six.

<sup>94</sup> Of which two reach the fourth degree of complication and one has an extra pair.

II. 2a.<sup>95</sup> In spite of the many simple single sentences which give the conversational tone to his dialogue Plato's other sentences show considerable complication and great variety of structure.

Lysias is the earliest of the orators, and the passages analysed belong to the first twenty years of the fourth century. His sentences are still fairly short; they have far fewer amplifications<sup>96</sup> than Isocrates and fewer linked sentences and links in general than the other orators. He has more clauses than any other author and most in his latest speech; appositions are normal for the orators. The number of simple sentences is lower than in any of the authors so far examined; the series of figures for degrees of complication agrees with Isocrates; but Lysias has more sentences of the fifth and higher degrees. He has, however, fewer pairs than any author since Herodotus. The percentage of simple single sentences (I. a. 1) is high compared with the other orators.<sup>97</sup> Nearly a quarter of his sentences belong to the single complicated group (I. a. 2; I. a. 4).<sup>98</sup> Complicated divided sentences<sup>99</sup> are rather less numerous, and complicated double sentences<sup>100</sup> much less numerous than in Isocrates. Lysias writes a leaner prose than the other orators, and because of his large number of clauses and complications may be said to be the clearest and most highly organised. The passage analysed

<sup>95</sup> Of which two reach the fourth degree and five have one extra pair and one has four extra pairs. One sentence of type II. 4 has five extra pairs and one has eight.

<sup>96</sup> The earliest speech has most.

<sup>97</sup> There are few sentences of types I. b. 1 and II. 1.

<sup>98</sup> A sixth of the total number have two complications (I. a. 4); ten sentences of the total of forty-seven reach the third and fourth degree of complication; four contain pairs of phrases.

<sup>99</sup> Of the total number of forty, fourteen belong to type I. b. 6, ten to type I. b. 5, seven to type I. b. 3, six to type I. b. 2, and three to type I. b. 6a. In all the types except I. b. 2 there are sentences reaching the third degree of complication, and sentences of types I. b. 6 and I. b. 6a reach the sixth degree. In all the types except I. b. 2 there are sentences with extra pairs; one sentence of type I. b. 6a has three extra pairs.

<sup>100</sup> Twenty-one sentences belong to type II. 2; only two reach the third degree of complication. Nine sentences belong to type II. 5, six to type II. 2a, five to type II. 3, and two to type II. 4; one of type II. 3 and one of type II. 4 reach the third degree of complication. Six sentences in all have extra pairs.

in the sixth speech differs so markedly from Lysias' average performance that the figures confirm the attribution to another author.<sup>101</sup>

The passages from Isocrates cover a period from 397 B. C. to 342 B. C. and come from a law court speech, a hortatory epistle, and an early and a late display speech. The sentences are longer than in any author except Dinarchus.<sup>102</sup> The number of amplifications approaches that in the tragedians,<sup>103</sup> and there are more links than in any earlier author but a very small number of linked sentences. Isocrates has considerably fewer clauses than Lysias, Isaeus, and Demosthenes, and fewer appositions than any other writer. The figures for complicated sentences agree with Lysias except that Isocrates falls off in the higher reaches.<sup>104</sup> He has slightly fewer pairs than Thucydides, but the number of sentences with seven or more pairs is equalled only by Dinarchus.<sup>105</sup> The distribution of sentences among the different types disagrees completely with that of Lysias. Very few are simple single sentences (I. a. 1).<sup>106</sup> Single complicated sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) are roughly half as common as in Lysias<sup>107</sup> but divided complicated sentences are rather more common.<sup>108</sup> There

<sup>101</sup> The sixth speech of Lysias is ascribed to another writer. The passage analysed differs from the average figures in the following respects; more amplifications (127), fewer clauses (110), more pairs (555), more simple sentences (42.5), more pairs of phrases (27.5), no sentence with more than three pairs, fewer single simple sentences (15), more single divided and simple double sentences (12.5 and 18.5), fewer double complicated sentences (10); a large proportion of type I. a. 4, but no sentences of types I. b. 2, I. b. 6a, II. 2a, II. 3, II. 4, or III.

<sup>102</sup> XII has even longer sentences than Dinarchus.

<sup>103</sup> The more practical XVI has noticeably fewer.

<sup>104</sup> The two display speeches are more complicated.

<sup>105</sup> XII is in this more highly developed than the other speeches.

<sup>106</sup> Simple divided (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1) account for 17.5%; the remaining 5.5% of simple sentences is made up by uncomplicated sentences of types II. 2a, II. 3, III, IV, V, VI.

<sup>107</sup> Of thirty-one only two reach the third, and one the fourth degree of complication; one (type I. a. 4) has an extra pair.

<sup>108</sup> Type I. b. 6 is again the most common (eighteen of a total of fifty-one), then I. b. 6a (twelve), I. b. 3 (ten), I. b. 5 (six), I. b. 2 (five). No sentence of type I. b. 2 exceeds the first degree of complication; the only sentences reaching the fourth degree belong to types I. b. 6 and I. b. 6a; one sentence of type I. b. 6 reaches the fifth degree of complication. The total number of sentences of this class containing extra

are more double complicated sentences than in any previous author and nearly half belong to type II. 2a.<sup>109</sup> Isocrates is a more florid writer than Lysias and elaborates his sentences by the paratactic construction of pairs rather than by the subordination of clauses and appositions. In particular he has further developed the structure and use of the double complicated sentence.

Isaeus writes shorter sentences and has fewer amplifications and links. The number of clauses steadily increases through his speeches, but the average of clauses and appositions is rather lower than in Lysias, and there are fewer sentences of the second and higher degrees of complication. In number of pairs Isaeus considerably exceeds Lysias and they increase through his speeches. Simple single sentences (I. a. 1) stand between Lysias and Isocrates.<sup>110</sup> Single complicated sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) also decrease, but the average is higher than in Isocrates.<sup>111</sup> Divided complicated sentences increase; the average is the same as in Isocrates, but the sentences are much more evenly divided between the types.<sup>112</sup> Double complicated sentences are much

pairs is thirty-one, about twice as many in proportion as in Lysias; three sentences of type I. b. 6 and I. b. 6a have seven pairs; one of type I. b. 6a has twelve.

<sup>109</sup> Of the total number of seventy-eight, type II. 2a accounts for thirty-four, type II. 2 for seventeen, type II. 3 for fifteen, type II. 4 for ten, type II. 5 for two. Twelve sentences of types II. 2a and II. 3 have no complication; nineteen sentences of all types reach at least the third degree of complication, eight (of all types except II. 5) reach the fourth. Eleven sentences of type II. 2a, ten sentences of type II. 3, seven sentences of type II. 4 have extra pairs; two sentences of type II. 4 have six extra pairs, one sentence has nine.

<sup>110</sup> Divided simple sentences are rare and double simple sentences slightly more common; the numbers for these three types decrease steadily through the speeches; the remaining uncomplicated sentences are of types II. 2a and III.

<sup>111</sup> Six of the twenty-six have two complications (type I. a. 4); two reach the third degree of complication and one the fourth; two have extra pairs.

<sup>112</sup> I. b. 2 and I. b. 3 have nine each, I. b. 5 and I. b. 6a have seven each; only five belong to the usually commoner type I. b. 6. No sentences pass the third degree of complication except one of I. b. 6 which rises to the sixth degree. Rather less than half the sentences have extra pairs; four have two extra pairs, and two (types I. b. 6 and 6a) have three extra pairs.

less frequent than in Isocrates.<sup>113</sup> Isaeus stands between Lysias and Isocrates: fuller than the one, sparer than the other; less highly organised than the one, less carefully subdivided than the other. His favorite sentence types are I. a. 2 and II. 2a.

Demosthenes' sentences are but slightly shorter than those of Isocrates.<sup>114</sup> Amplifications average a little less than Lysias,<sup>115</sup> but linked sentences are as common as in Isaeus, and the total number of links is higher than in Isocrates. The number of clauses and appositions agrees very closely with Isaeus. Demosthenes has fewer uncomplicated sentences than any other author and they decrease through the speeches; he has more sentences that reach at least the second degree than any other author, and more up to the third degree than any author except Dinarchus; above that his figures agree with Lysias. The number of pairs corresponds with Isaeus, but Demosthenes has fewer sentences with more than four pairs than Isocrates.<sup>116</sup> Demosthenes has fewer single simple sentences (I. a. 1) than any other author.<sup>117</sup> He has rather more complicated single sentences<sup>118</sup> (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) than Isaeus but rather fewer divided complicated sentences;<sup>119</sup> only Dinarchus has more complicated double sen-

<sup>113</sup> The numbers for the different types correspond closely with those for Isocrates except that Isaeus has more of type II. 5, and less of type II. 3 and II. 4. The only sentences which reach the third degree of complication are one of type II. 3 and three of type II. 4. Only five of the forty sentences have extra pairs (types II. 2a, II. 3, and II. 4). One of type II. 4 contains six pairs altogether.

<sup>114</sup> The *Crown* has longer sentences than the others.

<sup>115</sup> XXVII is ahead and close to Isaeus.

<sup>116</sup> The passage from his earliest speech has no sentence with more than four pairs.

<sup>117</sup> He has very few simple divided sentences (I. b. 1); they decrease through the speeches whereas the small number of double simple sentences (II. 1) increases slightly. The other uncomplicated sentences belong to types II. 2a, II. 4, and III.

<sup>118</sup> Nine out of forty-seven belong to type I. a. 4; two of each type have extra pairs, three of type I. a. 2 reach the fourth degree of complication.

<sup>119</sup> Of the total of fifty-three type I. b. 6 accounts for twenty, type I. b. 5 for ten, I. b. 2 for nine, and I. b. 6a for eight. Twenty sentences in all reach the third degree of complication; five (belonging to types I. b. 5, I. b. 6, I. b. 6a) reach the fourth degree; three sentences, all belonging to type I. b. 6, go higher. Twenty-three of these sentences in all have extra pairs; six (of types I. b. 2, I. b. 6, and I. b. 6a) have two extra pairs; two of type I. b. 6a have three extra pairs.

tences.<sup>120</sup> Demosthenes is a more concentrated writer than Isaeus; his sentences show a very high degree of organisation both by subordinate clauses and by subdivision; he has more complicated sentences than any other writer. The three "spurious" speeches of which passages were analysed differ notably from the genuine speeches: the seventh and seventeenth have affinities with each other, the eleventh stands alone.<sup>121</sup>

Aeschines' sentences are again slightly shorter. He has as many amplifications as Isocrates<sup>122</sup> and more linked sentences than any other orator;<sup>123</sup> his total number of links is also very high. He has even fewer clauses than Isocrates but nearly as many appositions as Demosthenes. He has more simple sentences than any of the orators. The number of pairs<sup>124</sup> agrees with Lysias, but Aeschines has one sentence with eleven pairs. He has more simple single sentences (I. a. 1) than Demosthenes;<sup>125</sup> only Xenophon and Lysias have as high a percentage of complicated single sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4).<sup>126</sup> The figure

<sup>120</sup> Demosthenes' eighty-seven sentences of this class are divided as follows: type II. 2a, twenty-five; type II. 2, twenty-two; type II. 4, seventeen; type II. 5, thirteen; type II. 3, ten. As in Lysias, a comparatively small number (fifteen) reaches the third degree of complication, and a very small number reaches the fourth degree (one of type II. 2, one of type II. 2a, and one of type II. 4). Twenty-four sentences have extra pairs; one sentence of II. 3 and one of type II. 4 have six pairs in all.

<sup>121</sup> Three passages from speeches, generally assumed to be wrongly ascribed to Demosthenes, show the following variations from the average figures in Demosthenes himself: VII:—more clauses, much fewer uncomplicated sentences, fewer paired sentences, no sentence with more than five pairs, smaller total of links, twice as many divided complicated sentences, fewer double complicated sentences. XVII:—more clauses, fewer uncomplicated sentences, fewer higher complicated sentences, fewer paired sentences, no sentence with more than four pairs, smaller total of links, twice as many divided complicated sentences, fewer double complicated sentences. XI:—sentences much longer, fewer clauses, no sentence with more than four degrees of complication, many more pairs per thousand terms and hundred sentences, more sentences containing many pairs, more links, nearly twice as many double complicated sentences.

<sup>122</sup> The number in the *Ctesiphon* is particularly high.

<sup>123</sup> The *False Embassy* nearly reaches the figure of Xenophon's *Hellenica*.

<sup>124</sup> The figures for pairs are higher in the *Ctesiphon* than in the *False Embassy*.

<sup>125</sup> The numbers for simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1) correspond closely with those in Isocrates.

<sup>126</sup> Four of the total of twenty-six belong to type I. a. 4; five reach

for divided complicated sentences falls between Lysias and Demosthenes,<sup>127</sup> but Aeschines has fewer complicated double sentences than any orator except Lycurgus.<sup>128</sup> He is a more informal writer than the other orators; he has many amplifications and links but fewer clauses and pairs; his favorite sentence types are I. a. 2, I. b. 6, and II. 2a.

Hyperides' sentences are not quite so long and have fewer amplifications.<sup>129</sup> He has fewer clauses<sup>130</sup> than Demosthenes and as many appositions. A quarter of his sentences have no complication; the figures for complicated sentences agree in general with those for Demosthenes, but Hyperides has more sentences (particularly in I) which reach the fourth degree and higher. He has slightly more pairs than Demosthenes; a large number of them are in sentences. The figures for sentences with four or more pairs agree with Isaeus.<sup>131</sup> The division of sentences among the main groups is very like the distribution in Demosthenes, except that Hyperides has rather fewer complicated single sentences<sup>132</sup> and complicated double sentences<sup>133</sup>

the third degree of complication and over (one rises to the fourth, and one to the fifth); four have pairs of phrases.

<sup>127</sup> The total of twenty-two sentences is distributed as follows: type I. b. 6, eleven; type I. b. 6a, five; type I. b. 2, four; type I. b. 5, two. The only sentences of the third degree of complication and over belong to types I. b. 6 (two rising to the fourth degree and one to the fifth) and I. b. 6a (one rising to the third degree and two to the fourth). All the types have sentences with extra pairs: one sentence of type I. b. 6 has three extra pairs, two of type I. b. 6a have two extra pairs.

<sup>128</sup> Ten of the nineteen sentences are of type II. 2a; the rest are evenly distributed over the other types. Two sentences of type II. 2a and one of type II. 3 reach the third degree of complication; one of type II. 2a reaches the fifth degree of complication. Sentences of all the types have extra pairs; one of type II. 4 has eleven pairs.

<sup>129</sup> His average is brought up by the funeral speech.

<sup>130</sup> I has more than the other speech.

<sup>131</sup> IV alone has sentences with more than four pairs.

<sup>132</sup> Five of Hyperides' twenty single complicated sentences have two complications (I. a. 4). Very few pass the second degree of complication; one of type I. a. 2 reaches the fourth degree, and one of type I. a. 4 the seventh; one of each type has a pair of phrases.

<sup>133</sup> Of the forty double complicated sentences eleven belong to type II. 2, eleven to type II. 2a, ten to type II. 3, five to type II. 4, and three to type II. 5. One of type II. 2 and two of type II. 3 reach the fourth degree of complication, one of type II. 2a and one of type II. 3 reach

and rather more divided complicated sentences.<sup>134</sup> As a whole, Hyperides' sentence construction is not unlike that of Demosthenes, but his style is rather fuller and slightly less highly organised.

Lycurgus presents a different picture. He has more amplifications than Isocrates and only slightly fewer links than Aeschines. He has fewer clauses than any of the orators and fewer appositions than all except Isocrates; and no orator has so small a number of sentences reaching to the second degree of complication and beyond. He has the same number of pairs as Hyperides but more sentences containing four and more pairs. His sentence construction is less varied than that of the other orators.<sup>135</sup> Divided and complicated sentences are far more numerous than in any other orator,<sup>136</sup> but there are as few double complicated sentences as in Aeschines.<sup>137</sup> Lycurgus is a florid writer with many amplifications and links; he has not the courage to organise his sentences as highly as Demosthenes or to subdivide them as skilfully as Isocrates.

Dinarchus writes longer sentences, has more amplifications, and has over a hundred more "links" than any other author. He has slightly more clauses than Lycurgus and more appositions than any fourth century author except Plato. He has more

the fifth degree, one of type II. 3 reaches the seventh. Eight sentences in all have extra pairs.

<sup>134</sup> The divided complicated sentences show the following figures: I. b. 3, eight; I. b. 6, seven; I. b. 6a, seven; I. b. 2, five; I. b. 5, four. No sentence of I. b. 2 reaches the third degree of complication; one sentence of type I. b. 6a reaches the fourth degree; one of I. b. 6 and one of I. b. 6a reach the fifth degree. All types except I. b. 5 have extra pairs.

<sup>135</sup> He has no examples of II. 3 and II. 4, and only one of I. a. 4, II. 5, and III. His uncomplicated sentences are all of types I. a. 1, I. b. 1, and II. 1; he has rather more of I. b. 1 than most orators.

<sup>136</sup> They are distributed as follows: I. b. 2, seven; I. b. 5, five; I. b. 3, four; I. b. 6, three; I. b. 6a, two. None of the sentences of types I. b. 2 and I. b. 5 exceed the first degree of complication; only one sentence (I. b. 5) has extra pairs and it has four. Three sentences reach the third degree of complication (I. b. 6; I. b. 6a) and one reaches the fourth (I. b. 3); one sentence (I. b. 6a) has three extra pairs and one sentence (I. b. 6) has six extra pairs.

<sup>137</sup> They belong to types II. 2 (five), II. 2a (three), and II. 5 (one). One sentence of type II. 2 reaches the fourth degree and one has an extra pair; two sentences of type II. 2a have extra pairs.

sentences of the third and higher degrees of complication than any other author. He has rather fewer pairs than Isocrates but more sentences containing a large number of pairs. He has the same number of simple single sentences (I. a. 1) as Lycurgus.<sup>138</sup> The figures for complicated divided sentences and complicated double sentences agree almost exactly with the figures for Demosthenes. Dinarchus has five sentences of type I. b. 6 and one or two of each of the other types of complicated divided sentence.<sup>139</sup> Eight of his nineteen double complicated sentences belong to type II. 2a.<sup>140</sup> Dinarchus is a flabby writer who puffs out his sentences with amplifications and links and tries to be more complicated than Demosthenes and more minutely subdivided than Isocrates.

It is therefore possible both to see a general development in sentence construction and to observe the particular tastes of particular authors. In general, sentences grow longer, clauses and pairs become more frequent, while appositions decrease; sentences are more elaborately organised both hypotactically and paratactically, and therefore the higher sentence types become more popular. Inside this general development Thucydides appears as a bold experimenter ahead of his time, and Plato and Xenophon have many features which are more common in the fifth century than the fourth; the orators divide themselves into two groups: the first leads from Lysias through Isaeus to Demosthenes and the second from Isocrates to Lycurgus and Dinarchus.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

<sup>138</sup> He has a very small number of simple divided sentences (I. b. 1) and simple double sentences (II. 1); there are also uncomplicated sentences of types II. 2a, II. 4, and III. None of his complicated single sentences (I. a. 2; I. a. 4) has an extra pair, and only one reaches the second degree of complication.

<sup>139</sup> Two sentences of type I. b. 5 reach the third degree of complication, one of I. b. 6a the fourth, and sentences of I. b. 6 reach the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh. Only two sentences of this class have no extra pairs; one (I. b. 5) has three extra pairs, one (I. b. 6a) has five, and one (I. b. 6) has eleven.

<sup>140</sup> Four belong to type II. 2, three each to types II. 3 and II. 4, one to type II. 5. All the types have sentences which reach the second degree of complication; sentences of type II. 2a reach the third and fourth; one sentence of type II. 3 reaches the fifth. Four sentences of types II. 2a, II. 3, and II. 4 have extra pairs.

ARISTOTLE'S *POLITICS*, IV, xii, 11-13  
 (TEXT AND INTERPRETATION).

In discussing the appointment of state officials Aristotle asserts<sup>1</sup> that the variations in method are found in three *ὅροι*, the different combinations of which will inevitably embrace all the modes of appointment. These *ὅροι* (or "terms") are (1) *τίνες οἱ καθιστάντες* (hereafter for the sake of simplicity called the "electorate"), (2) *ἐκ τίνων* (those eligible for office), and (3) *τίνα τρόπον* (the manner of choosing). Each of these *ὅροι* presents three variants (*διαφοραί*): (1) the "electorate" may include all the citizens, or a limited group, or a combination (*συνδυασμός*), i. e., for some appointments all, for some a limited group; (2) similarly with those eligible for office; (3) and the manner of choosing may be by election, or the casting of lots, or partly one and partly the other. These statements provide for the following scheme of twenty-seven modes.

TABLE I.

	Electorate (1st <i>ὅρος</i> )	Eligible for Office (2nd <i>ὅρος</i> )	Manner of Choosing (3rd <i>ὅρος</i> )
A.	All	1. All	(a) By Election (b) By Lot (c) By Election + Lot <i>(3rd συνδυασμός)</i>
		2. Some	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot <i>(3rd συνδυασμός)</i>
		3. All + Some <i>(2nd συνδυασμός)</i>	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot <i>(3rd συνδυασμός)</i>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Politics*, IV, xii, 10 f. (1300a 10-22): *εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ διαφοραὶ ἐν τρισὶν ὥροις, ὡν συντιθεμένων ἀναγκαῖον πάντας εἰλῆφθαι τὸν τρόπον. ἔστι δὲ τῶν τριῶν τούτων ἐν μὲν τίνες οἱ καθιστάντες τὰς ἀρχάς, δεύτερον δὲ ἐκ τίνων, λοιπὸν δὲ τίνα τρόπον. ἐκάστου δὲ τῶν τριῶν τούτων διαφοραὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν. η γὰρ πάντες οἱ πολῖται καθιστᾶσιν η τινές, καὶ η ἐκ πάντων η ἐτινῶν ἀφωρισμένων, οἷον η τιμήματι η γένει η ἀρετῇ η τινι τοιούτῳ ἄλλῳ . . . καὶ ταῦτα η αἰρέσει η κλήρῳ· πάλιν ταῦτα συνδυαζόμενα, λέγω δὲ τὰς μὲν τινές τὰς δὲ πάντες, καὶ τὰς μὲν ἐκ πάντων τὰς δὲ ἐκ τινῶν, καὶ τὰς μὲν αἰρέσει τὰς δὲ κλήρῳ.*

Electorate (1st $\delta\sigma\sigma$ )	Eligible for Office (2nd $\delta\sigma\sigma$ )	Manner of Choosing (3rd $\delta\sigma\sigma$ )
B. Some	1. All	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )
	2. Some	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )
	3. All + Some (2nd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )
C. All + Some (1st $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )	1. All	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )
	2. Some	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )
	3. All + Some (2nd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )	(a) Election (b) Lot (c) Election + Lot (3rd $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$ )

Later it will appear, I think, that Aristotle had all twenty-seven in mind, but in § 11 he makes two statements envisaging only limited areas of the whole field, and of these two areas one is included within the other.

(a) *τούτων [sc. τῶν τριῶν ὅρων]* δ' ἐκάστης ἔσονται τῆς διαφορᾶς τρόποι τέτταρες,<sup>2</sup> i.e., there are four modes of each variant of these three  $\delta\sigma\sigma$ . Newman suggests a reasonable interpretation of this, based on the assumption that here as a few lines below at the end of § 11 (*χωρὶς τῶν δύο συνδυασμῶν*) Aristotle takes into account each time only the  $\sigma\nu\nu\delta\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}s$  that belongs to the  $\delta\sigma\sigma$  that is being varied. We get then the following table showing τέτταρες τρόποι ἐκάστης διαφορᾶς τῶν τριῶν ὅρων.

<sup>2</sup> Here and throughout I am indebted to the text and *apparatus criticus* given by Immisch in the Teubner edition.

TABLE II.

## A. τέτταρες τρόποι ἐκάστης διαφορᾶς τοῦ πρώτου ὅρου

(1) τέτταρες τρόποι τῆς πρώτης διαφορᾶς τοῦ πρώτου ὅρου			
A 1a (all	all	election)	
A 1b ( "	"	lot )	
A 2a ( "	some	election)	
A 2b ( "	"	lot )	

## (2) τῆς δευτέρας διαφορᾶς

B 1a (some	all	election)
B 1b ( "	"	lot )
B 2a ( "	some	election)
B 2b ( "	"	lot )

## (3) τῆς τρίτης διαφορᾶς

C 1a (all + some	all	election)
C 1b ( "	"	lot )
C 2a ( "	some	election)
C 2b ( "	"	lot )

## B. τοῦ δευτέρου ὅρου

## (1) τῆς πρώτης διαφορᾶς

A 1a (all	all	election)
A 1b ( "	"	lot )
B 1a (some	"	election)
B 1b ( "	"	lot )

## (2) τῆς δευτέρας διαφορᾶς

A 2a (all	some	election)
A 2b ( "	"	lot )
B 2a (some	"	election)
B 2b ( "	"	lot )

## (3) τῆς τρίτης διαφορᾶς

A 3a (all	all + some	election)
A 3b ( "	"	lot )
B 3a (some	"	election)
B 3b ( "	"	lot )

## C. τοῦ τρίτου ὅρου

## (1) τῆς πρώτης διαφορᾶς

A 1a (all	all	election)
A 2a ( "	"	some election)
B 1a (some	"	all election)
B 2a ( "	"	some election)

## (2) τῆς δευτέρας διαφορᾶς

A 1b (all	all	lot )
A 2b ( "	"	some lot )
B 1b (some	"	all lot )
B 2b ( "	"	some lot )

## (3) τῆς τρίτης διαφορᾶς

A 1c (all	all	election + lot)
A 2c ( "	"	" )
B 1c (some	"	" )
B 2c ( "	"	" )

Each variant of each "term" in the above table shows four "modes," since only the coupling (*συνδυασμός*) belonging to the "term" in question is taken into account; and by eliminating duplications we find the total number of modes here considered reduced from thirty-six to twenty, viz., A 1 a, b, c, A 2 a, b, c, A 3 a, b, B 1 a, b, c, B 2 a, b, c, B 3 a, b, C 1 a, b, C 2 a, b. There are thus seven (A 3 c, B 3 c, C 1 c, C 2 c, C 3 a, b, c) which are omitted because they each involve two or three *συνδυασμού*.

(b) Aristotle then continues in § 11: ἡ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ πάντων αἱρέσει ἡ πάντες ἐκ πάντων κλήρῳ (καὶ [ἢ] ἐξ ἀπάντων ἡ ὡς ἀνὰ μέρος, οἷον κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ δῆμους καὶ φραγίας ἔως ἀν διέλθῃ διὰ πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν, ἡ ἀεὶ ἐξ ἀπάντων) <ἢ πάντες ἐκ τινῶν αἱρέσει ἡ πάντες ἐκ τινῶν κλήρῳ<sup>3</sup> ἡ καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖτως τὰ δὲ ἐκείνως. πάλιν εἰ τινὲς οἱ καθιστάντες, ἡ ἐκ πάντων αἱρέσει ἡ ἐκ πάντων κλήρῳ ἡ ἐκ τινῶν αἱρέσει ἡ ἐκ τινῶν κλήρῳ ἡ τὰ μὲν οὖτως τὰ δὲ ἐκείνως (λέγω δὲ τὰ μὲν [ἐκ πάντων] αἱρέσει τὰ δὲ κλήρῳ). ὥστε δώδεκα οἱ τρόποι γίγνονται χωρὶς τῶν δύο συνδυασμῶν.

Here, for the purpose of illustration, Aristotle confines himself to the modes produced by variants of the third "term" alone (manner of choosing), and so gives us A 1 a, b, c, <A 2 a, b, c>, B 1 a, b, c, B 2 a, b, c, which will be seen to coincide with the modes exhibited under C in our second table. We thus have twelve out of the thirty-six (or, eliminating duplicates, twenty) items of Table II.

So far, then, Aristotle has told us (a) that each variant of each "term," if only one *συνδυασμός* be employed (the one belonging to the term under consideration), provides four modes; (b) that since there are three variants of each term, the total number of modes for each term (with only one *συνδυασμός*) is twelve.

From this point, having illustrated his meaning in a limited way, Aristotle proceeds (§§ 12, 13) to consider the constitutional complexion given by the modes; and there is no reason now why he should fail to label modes involving two or three *συνδυασμοί*. In fact, even in the mutilated text as printed by Immisch, there is evidence that he does include in his survey at least the second *συνδυασμός*.<sup>4</sup> The whole passage is full of pitfalls for the copyist, and appears to have suffered from transposition, from inclusion of glosses, and particularly from omissions due to similarity of terminations in phrases. Immisch has already pretty well taken care of the glosses; Spengel has furnished one of the needed supplements of lost phrases; and I believe that one essential change of punctuation from that of the Teubner text, transposition of one word,<sup>5</sup> and inclusion of two more supplements provide a text that gives a complete survey of the twenty-seven modes which Aristotle had in mind and a reasonable allocation

<sup>3</sup> Conring's supplement as quoted by Immisch.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. § 12: τὰς μὲν ἐκ πάντων τὰς δ' ἐκ τινῶν. So § 13 *init.*

<sup>5</sup> Already suggested in the Latin version of Guilelmus and in a gloss or correction of one set of MSS.

of them to the four types of government of which he is treating.<sup>6</sup> What Aristotle wrote, then, I suggest one can disentangle from the following text by omitting the expressions within square brackets. (§ 12) *τούτων δ' αἱ μὲν δύο καταστάσεις δημοτικάι, τὸ πάντας ἐκ πάντων <καὶ τὸ πάντας τὰς μὲν ἐκ τινῶν τὰς δ' ἐκ πάντων><sup>7</sup> αἱρέσει ἡ κλήρῳ ἡ ἀμφοῖν, τὰς μὲν κλήρῳ τὰς δ' αἱρέσει τῶν ἀρχῶν. τὸ δὲ μὴ πάντας ἄμα μὲν καθιστάναι, ἔξ ἀπάντων δ' ἡ ἐκ τινῶν ἡ κλήρῳ ἡ αἱρέσει ἡ ἀμφοῖν, ἡ τὰς μὲν ἐκ πάντων τὰς δ' ἐκ τινῶν <ἡ αἱρέσει ἡ κλήρῳ ἡ><sup>8</sup> ἀμφοῖν (τὸ δὲ ἀμφοῖν λέγω τὰς μὲν κλήρῳ τὰς δ' αἱρέσει) πολιτικόν,<sup>9</sup> καὶ τὸ τινὰς ἐκ πάντων ἡ αἱρέσει καθιστάναι ἡ κλήρῳ ἡ ἀμφοῖν, τὰς μὲν κλήρῳ τὰς δ' αἱρέσει, [διλιγαρχικόν] διλιγαρχικώτερον δέ. [καὶ τὸ ἔξ ἀμφοῖν] τὸ δὲ τὰς μὲν ἐκ πάντων τὰς δ' ἐκ τινῶν<sup>10</sup> πολιτικὸν ἀριστοκρατικῶς. [ἡ τὰς μὲν αἱρέσει τὰς δὲ κλήρῳ] τὸ δὲ τινὰς ἐκ τινῶν διλιγαρχικόν, καὶ τὸ τινὰς ἐκ τινῶν κλήρῳ (μὴ γιγνόμενον δ' ὅμοιως)<sup>11</sup> καὶ τὸ τινὰς ἐκ τινῶν ἀμφοῖν. τὸ δὲ τινὰς ἔξ ἀπάντων οὐκ διλιγαρχικόν.<sup>12</sup> τὸ*

<sup>6</sup> δημοκρατία, πολιτεία, διλιγαρχία, ἀριστοκρατία.

<sup>7</sup> The vulgate text is impossible. Aristotle professes to give two schemes that are δημοτικά, but we have only A 1 a, b, c, which is not two but either three or one. The supplement provides for the addition of A 3 a, b, c, a group which is nearest in political character to A 1 a, b, c, and in fact is the only other one that might be characterized as δημοτικόν.

<sup>8</sup> Supplement by Spengel (Immissch).

<sup>9</sup> Immissch follows πολιτικόν with a full stop; but his bracketing of διλιγαρχικόν a little farther along compels one to interpret τὸ τινὰς ἐκ πάντων κτλ. as another πολιτικόν type. This is supported both by the introductory καὶ τό (instead of τὸ δὲ as usual where a new type is being treated) and by a consideration of the nature of the arrangement in question (= B 1 a, b, c), which cannot be oligarchic, since all citizens are eligible for office, but has a tinge of oligarchy in the fact that those who appoint are a limited group.

<sup>10</sup> Immissch reads καὶ τὸ ἔξ ἀμφοῖν and brackets τὸ δὲ τὰς . . . ἐκ τινῶν. It seems to me that the present text is favored by the sort of connective used (adversative as against copulative) and by the general form of expression (ἐκ πάντων . . . ἐκ τινῶν as against ἀμφοῖν, a word elsewhere reserved for manner of choosing).

<sup>11</sup> Newman understands κλήρῳ with γιγνόμενον and takes the phrase to mean that even though the choice is not made by lot, but by election, the situation is just as truly oligarchical.

<sup>12</sup> For τινὰς ἔξ ἀπάντων οὐκ διλιγαρχικόν Immissch keeps the vulgate τινὰς ἔξ ἀπάντων, with the following note in his *apparatus criticus*: "post ἀπάντων add. non oligarchicum Guil., οὐκ διλιγαρχικόν glossam praebet p<sup>2</sup>." I believe that it is this διλιγαρχικόν which has been misplaced in the MSS just before διλιγαρχικώτερον a few lines above.

δὲ<sup>13</sup> ἐκ τινῶν αἱρέσει <ἢ κλήρῳ ἢ τὰ μὲν κλήρῳ τὰ δ' αἱρέσει> πάντας ἀριστοκρατικόν.

There is one expression in the second sentence of § 12 that needs comment, viz., *τὸ μὴ πάντας ἄμα μὲν καθιστάναι*. Just what does Aristotle mean? We can dismiss at once the possibility of equating this with *τὸ τινάς καθιστάναι*, an arrangement taken up later in the section. One is tempted at first sight to regard it as parallel to the expression used in § 11 of those eligible for office,

<sup>13</sup> Immisch adopts Rabe's *τοτὲ δὲ*. The text of these last two sentences as published by Immisch (*τὸ δὲ τινὰς ἐξ ἀπάντων τοτὲ δὲ ἐκ τινῶν αἱρέσει πάντας ἀριστοκρατικόν*) is supremely unconvincing. (a) If *τινάς* be taken as masculine (in accord with the preceding text) we have the intrusion of something new, a crossing of lines that Aristotle manifestly did not contemplate in §§ 10, 11; i. e., a system wherein some of the offices are filled by a limited group choosing (in some unspecified manner) from all the citizens, and the rest are filled by all the citizens choosing by election from a limited group,—a confusing cross between B 1 and A 2a. In VI, i, 2 (1316b 39-1317a 10) Aristotle explicitly disclaims having taken hybrids into account: *ἴτι δὲ καὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισκεπτέον πάντων τῶν τρόπων· ταῦτα γὰρ συνδυάζομενα ποιεῖ τὰς πολιτείας ἐπαλλάγτειν, ὥστε ἀριστοκρατίας τε διλιγαρχικὰς εἶναι καὶ πολιτείας δημοκρατικωτέρας.* Λέγω δὲ τὸς συνδυασμοὺς οὓς δεῖ μὲν ἐπισκοπεῖν, οὐν ἐσκεμμένοι δ' εἰσὶ νῦν, οἷον ἂν τὸ μὲν βουλευόμενον καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀρχαιρεσίας διλιγαρχικῶς ἢ συντεταγμένον, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὰ δικαστήρια ἀριστοκρατικῶς, ἢ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸ βουλευόμενον διλιγαρχικῶς, ἀριστοκρατικῶς δὲ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀρχαιρεσίας, ἢ κατ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον μὴ πάντα συντεθῆ τὰ τῆς πολιτείας οἰκεία. (It cannot mean C 3a, for this is already taken account of in § 12, with Spengel's inevitable supplement.) And why omit reference to method of appointment in the first half, and limit to election in the second half? And how could a system be dubbed ἀριστοκρατικόν which leaves some of the offices wide open to any citizen? (b) If *τινάς* be taken as feminine, we have a break with Aristotle's normal type of expression, which would be *τὸ δὲ τὰς μὲν ἐξ ἀπάντων τὰς δ' ἐκ τινῶν αἱρέσει πάντας* (= A 3a). This, while an obstacle, is not an insuperable one; but there is a decisive objection in that this mode of appointment (A 3a) is already taken care of at the beginning of § 12 (cf. n. 7). And again, why limit to the method *αἱρέσει*, since the manner of choosing is nowhere in this chapter treated as a significant factor?

The text here suggested provides a simple and normal expression. But it does more than that; added to the supplement given above (cf. n. 7) it fills out a complete consideration of all the twenty-seven modes that Aristotle had in mind in §§ 10, 11. Without these supplements the text covers only A 1a, b, c (§ 12), B 1a, b, c (§ 12), B 2a, b, c (§ 13), B 3a, b, c (§ 13), C 1a, b, c (§ 12), C 2a, b, c (§ 12), C 3<a, b, c (§ 12, with Spengel's supplement), plus a hybrid that cannot be placed anywhere in the scheme and produces sheer confusion.

viz., ἐξ ἀπάντων . . . ὡς ἀνὰ μέρος, κτλ., and thus refer it to a situation where the electorate would comprise all the citizens, but only a part (e.g., one tribe) at a time. In view of the present context, this would be attributing to such cases a political significance. But, if that is correct, why did not Aristotle provide for them in §§ 10 f.? There, in an all-embracing statement, which must cover all that he regards as being significant, he asserts that the three "terms" have each *three variants*, which he then specifies. The assumption which we are now considering would present a *fourth* variant each for "terms" 1 and 2. Inasmuch as such a variant is not embraced in Aristotle's scheme as outlined in §§ 10 f., we must conclude that for him it had no political significance; it is not a true variant but merely a non-significant alternative form of these two "terms." This is borne out by xi, 2 f. (1298a 9-17): *τὸ μὲν οὖν πάντας καὶ περὶ ἀπάντων δημοτικόν· τὴν τοιαύτην γὰρ ισότητα ζητεῖ ὁ δῆμος. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τρόποι τοῦ πάντας πλείους, εἴς μὲν τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀλλὰ μὴ πάντας ἀθρόους, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τῆς Τηλεκλέους ἐστὶ τοῦ Μιλησίου· καὶ ἐν ᾧ λαίς δὲ πολιτείαις βουλεύονται αἱ συναρχίαι συνιοῦσαι, εἰς δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς βαδίζουσι πάντες κατὰ μέρος ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν καὶ τῶν μορίων τῶν ἐλαχίστων παντελῶς ἔως ἂν διεξέλθῃ διὰ πάντων.* Another reason for rejecting the above suggested interpretation is that it leaves a gap in the scheme; all of group C is omitted, and yet group C is clearly visualized by Aristotle in §§ 10 f. It would seem, then, that the expression which we are trying to elucidate (*τὸ μὴ πάντας ἄμα μὲν καθιστάναι*) is what Aristotle would normally (and more clearly) express by *τὸ τὰς μὲν πάντας τὰς δὲ τινὰς καθιστάναι*. If so, group C is brought within Aristotle's purview and the scheme of twenty-seven modes is rounded out completely.

Actually, this number may be considered as reduced to nine, because Aristotle here attaches no significance to variants in the manner of choosing, whether it be by election or by lot or by a combination of these. In some other passages, it is true, he speaks of appointment by lot as democratic, appointment by election as *ἀριστοκρατικόν* or *οὐλιγαρχικόν*.<sup>14</sup> But in several places

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Politics*, II, viii, 4 (1273a 17 f.): *τὸ δὲ ἀμίσθους καὶ μὴ κληρωτὰς ἀριστοκρατικὸν θετέον;* II, ix, 2 (1273b 39-41): *εἶναι γὰρ [sc. ἔνοι οὖνται] τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρειῷ πάγῳ βουλήν ὀλιγαρχικόν, τὸ δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἱρετὰς ἀριστοκρατικόν;* IV, vii, 3 (1294b 7-9): *δοκεῖ δημοκρατικὸν μὲν εἶναι τὸ κληρωτὰς εἶναι τὰς ἀρχάς, τὸ δ' αἱρετὰς ὀλιγαρχικόν; ibid., 5 (1294b 31-33): οἱ δ' ὀλιγαρχίαιν [sc. ἔγχειροισι λέγειν τὴν Δακεδαιμονίων πολιτείαν]* διὰ τὸ πολλὰ

he admits appointment by election into a democratic system;<sup>15</sup> and in the present passage, starting by distinctly including election, lot, and a combination of the two as features of democracy, he continues as if the matter were one of indifference, the real criteria being (a) who has a voice in the appointment of officials and (b) who has the right to stand for office.

We may now proceed with a general view of §§ 12 f., the most vital in the whole passage.

*τούτων* at the beginning is all-inclusive; and we get then in four sentences a critique of all twenty-seven modes in the following order: (1) A 1 a, b, c, *<A 3 a, b, c>*; (2) C 1 a, b, c, C 3 *<a, b>c*, B 1 a, b, c, B 3 a, b, c; (3) B 2 a, b, c; (4) A 2 a, *<b, c>*.

Aristotle's allocation of these modes to the four types of government will be most readily appraised from the following table, and, if we bear in mind, first, Aristotle's insistence (a) on the close connection between *ἀριστοκρατία* and *πολιτεία*<sup>16</sup> and

*ἔχειν δλιγαρχικά, οἷον τὸ πάσας αἱρετὰς εἶναι καὶ μηδεμίαν κληρωτήν.* Cf. also IV, xi, 6 f. (1298a 35-1298b 11); VI, i, 10 (1317b 41-1318a 3); II, iii, 11 (1266a 5-9).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Politics*, IV, xi, 4 f. (1298a 19-34): *ἄλλος δὲ τρόπος τὸ πάντας ἀθρόους . . . τὰ δ' ἄλλα τὰς ἀρχὰς βουλεύεσθαι τὰς ἐφ' ἔκαστοις τεταγμένας, αἱρετὰς οὖσας ἐξ ἀπάντων η̄ κληρωτάς· ἄλλος δὲ τρόπος τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς εὐθύνας ἀπαντᾶν τοὺς πολίτας . . . τὰ δ' ἄλλα τὰς ἀρχὰς διοικεῖν αἱρετὰς οὖσας, δσας ἐνδέχεται· τοιαῦται δ' εἰσὶν δσας ἀρχεῖν ἀναγκαῖον τοὺς ἐπισταμένους . . . οὗτοι μὲν οὖν οἱ τρόποι δημοκρατικοὶ πάντες; VI, i, 8 (1317b 18-21): *τὰ τοιαῦτα δημοτικά· τὸ αἱρεῖσθαι τὰς ἀρχὰς πάντας ἐκ πάντων . . . τὸ κληρωτὰς εἶναι τὰς ἀρχὰς η̄ πάσας η̄ δσαι μὴ ἐμπειρίας δέονται καὶ τέχνης; VI, ii, 3 (1318b 27-31): καὶ συμφέρον ἔστι τῇ πρότερον ρήθείσῃ δημοκρατίᾳ καὶ ὑπάρχειν εἴωθεν, αἱρεῖσθαι μὲν τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ εὐθύνειν καὶ δικάζειν πάντας, ἀρχεῖν δὲ τὰς μεγίστας αἱρετούς καὶ ἀπὸ τιμημάτων; VI, iii, 5 (1320b 11-17) (of democracy at Tarentum): *τὰς ἀρχὰς πάσας ἐποίησαν διττάς, τὰς μὲν αἱρετὰς τὰς δὲ κληρωτάς, τὰς μὲν κληρωτὰς δπως δ δῆμος αὐτῶν μετέχῃ, τὰς δ' αἱρετὰς ἵνα πολιτεύωνται βέλτιον.* ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς μερίζοντας, τοὺς μὲν κληρωτούς τοὺς δ' αἱρετούς. πῶς μὲν οὖν δεῖ τὰς δημοκρατίας κατασκευάζειν είρηται. Further, in IV, iv, 1-7; v, 1, 3-8, where Aristotle is presenting types of democracy and oligarchy, he makes no reference to *αἱρεσίς* or *κλήρωσις*.**

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Politics*, II, viii, 3 (cited in n. 17); IV, vii, 3 (1294b 10 f.): *ἀριστοκρατικὸν τοίνυν καὶ πολιτικὸν τὸ ἐξ ἐκατέρας ἐκάτερον λαβεῖν; IV, ix, 2 (1295a 31-34): καὶ γὰρ ἡς καλοῦσιν ἀριστοκρατίας . . . τὰ μὲν ἐξωτέρῳ πίπτουσι ταῖς πλεισταῖς τῶν πόλεων τὰ δὲ γειτνισσοὶ τῇ καλουμένῃ πολιτείᾳ· διὸ περὶ ἀμφοῖν ὡς μιᾶς λεκτέον; IV, xi, 7 (1298b 10 f.): *τὰ μὲν πολιτείας ἀριστοκρατικῆς ἔστι τούτων τὰ δὲ πολιτείας αὐτῆς; IV, xiii, 4 (1301a 11-14):**

(b) on the middle position of *πολιτεία* and *ἀριστοκρατία* as against *δημοκρατία* on the one side and *ολιγαρχία* on the other,<sup>17</sup> and, second, his acceptance of the view that of these two middle types of constitution *πολιτεία* leans toward *δημοκρατία* and *ἀριστοκρατία* toward *ολιγαρχία*,<sup>18</sup> we shall be convinced, I think, that (with perhaps one exception) it is a satisfactory distribution.

TABLE III.

Electorate	Those Eligible	Characteristic
A 1 a, b, c All	All	δημοτικόν (§ 12)
A 2 a, <b, c> "	Some	ἀριστοκρατικόν (§ 13)
<A 3 a, b, c> "	All + Some	δημοτικόν (§ 12)
B 1 a, b, c Some	All	πολιτικόν, ολιγαρχικώτερον δέ (§ 12)
B 2 a, b, c "	Some	ολιγαρχικόν (§ 13)
B 3 a, b, c "	All + Some	πολιτικόν ἀριστοκρατικός (§ 13)
C 1 a, b, c All + Some	All	πολιτικόν (§ 12)
C 2 a, b, c "	Some	"
C 3 <a, b, c>	All + Some	"

Obviously A 1 and B 2 represent the two extremes and are properly designated respectively as *δημοτικόν* and *ολιγαρχικόν*.

τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα δημοτικά, . . . τὰ δὲ δεύτερα ολιγαρχικά, . . . τὰ δὲ τρίτα ἀριστοκρατικά καὶ πολιτικά, . . . ; V, i, 4 (1301b 8-10) : . . . οἷον ἐκ δημοκρατίας ολιγαρχίαν ἡ δημοκρατίαν ἔξ ολιγαρχίας ἡ πολιτείαν καὶ ἀριστοκρατίαν ἐκ τούτων ἡ ταῦτα ἔξ έκεινων . . .

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Politics*, II, viii, 3 (1273a 4-6) : τῶν δὲ πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς ἀριστοκρατίας καὶ τῆς πολιτείας τὰ μὲν εἰς δῆμον ἐκκλίνει μᾶλλον τὰ δ' εἰς ολιγαρχίαν; IV, vi, 2 (1293b 33 f.) : ἔστι γάρ ἡ πολιτεία ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν μείζης ολιγαρχίας καὶ δημοκρατίας; IV, vii, 2 (1294a 41 f.) : διὸ καὶ πολιτικόν, μέμεικται γάρ ἔξ ἀμφοῖν; IV, vii, 3 (cited in n. 16); V, vi, 3 (1307a 5-12) : λύνονται δὲ μάλιστα αἱ τε πολιτείαι καὶ αἱ ἀριστοκρατίαι διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πολιτείᾳ τοῦ δικαίου παρέκβασιν. ἀρχὴ γάρ τὸ μῆν μεμείχθαι καλῶς ἐν μὲν τῇ πολιτείᾳ δημοκρατίαν καὶ ολιγαρχίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀριστοκρατίᾳ ταῦτα τε καὶ τὴν ἀρετήν, μάλιστα δὲ τὰ δύο· λέγω δὲ τὰ δύο δῆμον καὶ ολιγαρχίαν. ταῦτα γάρ αἱ πολιτείαι τε πειρῶνται μειγνύναι καὶ αἱ πολλαὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἀριστοκρατίῶν.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Politics*, IV, vi, 2 (1293b 34-37) : εἰώθαστ δὲ καλεῖν τὰς μὲν ἀποκλινούσας ὡς πρὸς τὴν δημοκρατίαν πολιτείας, τὰς δὲ πρὸς τὴν ολιγαρχίαν μᾶλλον ἀριστοκρατίας; V, vi, 4 (1307a 12-23) : διαφέρουσι γάρ τῶν δυομαζομένων πολιτειῶν αἱ ἀριστοκρατίαι τούτῳ [sc. a point previously mentioned; cf. text in n. 17] . . . τὰς γάρ ἀποκλινούσας μᾶλλον πρὸς τὴν ολιγαρχίαν ἀριστοκρατίας καλοῦσιν, τὰς δὲ πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος πολιτείας . . . δλως δ' ἐφ' δπότερον ἀν ἐγκλίνῃ ἡ πολιτεία, ἐπὶ ταῦτα μεθίσταται . . . οἷον ἡ μὲν πολιτεία εἰς δῆμον, ἀριστοκρατία δ' εἰς ολιγαρχίαν.

A 3 is only a slight modification of A 1, and no one could object to bracketing these two together.

The other six may all be reasonably placed in the middle group comprising *πολιτεία* and *ἀριστοκρατία*. Of these, C 1 and C 3, permitting all the citizens, either in all cases or in some, to act as the appointive body, may be said to lean toward *δημοκρατία* and hence be termed correctly *πολιτικά*.

A 2, confining the appointees to a limited group, but with everybody privileged to participate in appointing, leans enough toward B 2 to be rated as *ἀριστοκρατικόν*.

Of B 1 and B 3, the latter seems to me to lean more toward oligarchy, and perhaps Aristotle might elucidate his characterizations of these two by saying that in *πολιτικόν*, *δλιγαρχικώτερον* δέ he meant "characteristic of a *πολιτεία*, but with a tinge of *δλιγαρχία*," whereas in *πολιτικὸν ἀριστοκρατικῶς* he meant "characteristic of a *πολιτεία* but with so much of *δλιγαρχία* about it that it smacks of *ἀριστοκρατία*."

Aristotle's gradation, then, from *δημοτικόν* to *δλιγαρχικόν* would appear to be as follows.

TABLE IV.

Electorate	Those Eligible	Characteristic
A 1      All	All	<i>δημοτικόν</i>
A 3      "	All + Some	"
C 1      All + Some	All	<i>πολιτικόν</i>
C 3      "	All + Some	"
C 2      "	Some	"
B 1      Some	All	<i>πολιτικόν, δλιγαρχικώτερον</i> δέ
B 3      "	All + Some	<i>πολιτικὸν ἀριστοκρατικῶς</i>
A 2      All	Some	<i>ἀριστοκρατικόν</i>
B 2      Some	"	<i>δλιγαρχικόν</i>

The real difficulty, I think, is found in labelling C 2 as *πολιτικόν*; it appears to me to be on the oligarchic side of A 2, and I should have been inclined to set it between that and B 2. But since the label *πολιτικόν* is vouched for in what editors regard as a sound portion of the vulgate text, the flaw (if it is one) must be due not to faulty MS tradition but to Aristotle himself, and so cannot be remedied. Otherwise, I suggest, the text as emended exhibits on Aristotle's part an adequate consideration of the complete scheme of twenty-seven modes with which he begins his discussion.

O. J. TODD.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

## TOPICS OF PITY IN THE POETRY OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

The theory of the emotion of pity in Greek and Latin literature has been sketched in a German dissertation<sup>1</sup> and has received notice in hand-books for the history of ideas.<sup>2</sup> No detailed study, however, of either the theory or the topics and contexts of pity in ancient literature has been made, though some divisions of the subject have fared better than others.<sup>3</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to contribute a chapter towards such a study by presenting as fully as the frequently fragmentary nature of the material permits an account of the discussions of pity and references to it that occur in the poetry of the Roman Republic. And since this is an intermediary chapter, it will be necessary to draw upon the larger history of pity for illustration and elucidation.

Pity is not a simple or clear-cut emotion. At one extreme of its range it is almost scorn,<sup>4</sup> at the other it is so "akin to love" that it is not always possible to distinguish it from a general feeling of kindness and good will. Thus *pietas* may fairly be translated "loving kindness," as Miss Steuart turns it in her translation of Ennius' *O pietas animi*.<sup>5</sup> But, waiving the question at what period in Latin literature *pietas* comes to mean "pity,"<sup>6</sup> I find no context in the poetry of the Republican period

<sup>1</sup> Konrad von Orelli, *Die philosophische Auffassungen des Mitleids* (Bonn, C. Georgi, 1912). I here gladly acknowledge my deep obligation to the librarian of Columbia University for courtesies extended to me there.

<sup>2</sup> Rudolf Eisler, *Wörterbuch d. phil. Begriffe*, s. v. "Mitleid"; Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, s. v. "Pity"; R.-E., s. v. "Eleos"; Schmidt, *Ethik d. alt. Gr.*, II, pp. 290-294.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e. g., for the Altar of Pity in Athens, Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*, II, pp. 436-440; for Vergil's compassion, E. Adelaide Hahn, "Vergil and the Under-Dog," *T. A. P. A.*, LVI (1925), pp. 185-212.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Tennyson's "scornful pity," *Geraint and Enid*, 859; and the horrible pity of Grandet for his servant Nanon, a pity which was calculated to keep her mindful of her condition when Grandet employed her (*Balzac, Eugénie Grandet, ad init.*).

<sup>5</sup> Ethel Mary Steuart, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the brilliant discussion of Henry, *Aeneidea*, I, pp. 175-187; and Cyril Bailey, *Religion in Vergil*, pp. 80-85.

in which *pius* seems to mean "pitying" or *pietas* "pity." On the other hand, a tragic fragment of unknown authorship<sup>7</sup> seems to mark a clear difference between *misericordia* and *pietas*, in that the speaker advances from a general appeal for pity to a particular and more cogent appeal to the bond of brotherhood and the *pietas* involved therein:

Te nihil  
hominum fortunae, nihil commiserescit meae?  
Finge advenam esse; nihil fraterni nominis  
sollempne auxilium et nomen Pietatis movet?

Schopenhauer says that weeping is caused by sympathy for oneself, and among other illustrations cites the tears of Odysseus on hearing Demodocus' song of the fall of Troy.<sup>8</sup> The circumstance that it contained a rare word for "cloak" has preserved Livius Andronicus' version of the previous occasion in the same book when Ulysses wept at another song about himself:<sup>9</sup> *simul ac dacrinas de ore noegeo detersit*. This as it were objective sympathy which a man feels with himself as he is reminded of the vicissitudes of his fortunes may be sorrow's crown of sorrow that remembers happier things, the sentiment expressed by a fragment of Accius' *Eurysaces*: *Heu me miserum, cum haec recordor, cum illos reminiscor dies.*<sup>10</sup> And it may be a pleasant kind of pity as in happier circumstances one reviews past misfortune. Such pleasure Cicero expects to find in reading Lucceius' account of his consulship,<sup>11</sup> and this pleasurable recollection of past grief has a long tradition in ancient literature, beginning with Homer's *Odyssey*, and proceeding through a fragment of Euripides which Cicero translates: *suavis laborum est praeteritorum memoria.*<sup>12</sup> In his letter to Lucceius Cicero

<sup>7</sup> *Trag. Incert.*, 110-113 W. In my references to the fragments of Latin poetry W. = E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* (Loeb Classical Library, 1935-38, three volumes); R. = Otto Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta* (2nd edition, 1871, two volumes).

<sup>8</sup> Schopenhauer, *Sämtliche Werke*, II, p. 697 (Reclam); Homer, *Od.*, VIII, 521 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Homer, *Od.*, VIII, 83-89; Livius Andronicus, *Odissia*, 22 W.

<sup>10</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 342 W. <sup>11</sup> Cicero, *Ad Fam.*, V, 12, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Cicero, *De Fin.*, II, 105. Cf. Homer, *Od.*, XV, 400 f., and Euripides, *fr.* 113 N<sup>2</sup> (see Nauck's note for further parallels). It is to such pleasure that Aeneas looks forward when he says (*Vergil, Aen.*, I, 203): *forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.*

correlates with this pleasant recollection of past grief the pity felt by one who himself free from pain watches another's misfortunes, and Cicero finds that pity under such conditions is pleasurable: *ceteris vero nulla perfunctis propria molestia, casus autem alienos sine ullo dolore intuentibus etiam ipsa misericordia est iucunda.* But as Cicero proceeds to offer examples of the sort of trials the spectacle of which offers a pleasurable sense of pity, e. g., the noble and stoic death of Epaminondas, we gather that the element of pleasure which he finds in such pity arises rather from the interest of the story of the trial, and the reader's admiration of the courage shown by the hero in his downfall: *at viri saepe excellentis anticipites variique casus habent admirationem, exspectationem, laetitiam, molestiam, spem, timorem: si vero exitu notabili concluduntur, expletur animus iucundissima lectionis voluptate.*

Martha observed a resemblance between Cicero's pleasurable pity and the sentiment expressed in the opening lines of the second book of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*:<sup>13</sup>

Suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis,  
e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem;  
non quia vexari quemquamst iucunda voluptas,  
sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suave est.

But, whereas Lucretius develops his eloquent proem out of a proverbial expression, ἔξαντης λεύσσω τούμὸν κακὸν ἄλλον ἔχοντα,<sup>14</sup> or, as Cicero elsewhere puts it, *cupio istorum naufragia ex terra intueri*,<sup>15</sup> in the letter to Lucceius Cicero has woven this commonplace together with the thought that the memory of one's own past tribulations is sweet. There is furthermore an essential difference of purpose and meaning in the two passages. Lucretius' pleasure in the misfortunes of others is but a means to the recommendation of his philosophy to the blind souls that have not yet seen the light, whereas Cicero's pleasure in pity is marked by an admiration of the commiserated person, the moral effect of which might be to inspire the pitier to meet his own misfortunes with greater courage. It may be observed that Aristotle does not relate the pleasurable character of recollections of events

<sup>13</sup> C. Martha, *Mélanges de littérature ancienne*, p. 173.

<sup>14</sup> Leutsch and Schneidewin, I, pp. 81 f. Cf. Pearson on Sophocles, fr. 636.

<sup>15</sup> Cicero, *Ad Att.*, II, 7, 4.

in themselves unpleasant<sup>16</sup> to self-pity, though in his discussion of pity he says that the pitiable must be such as the pitier recalls having suffered, or may expect to suffer, if not in his own person, in that of one near to him.<sup>17</sup> And when in the *Politics* Aristotle recognizes that pleasure attends the feeling of pity, he means the pleasure consequent on the relief of the emotions, the *catharsis*,<sup>18</sup> a pleasure which is, I think, unrelated to the pleasure to which Cicero refers.

A fragment of Ennius' *Annales* records an occasion in Roman history when perhaps the wives of condemned captives<sup>19</sup> sought by their tears to move their enemy to take pity on them: *cogebant hostes lacrumantes ut misererent.* The scanty remains of Republican tragedy are not such as to enable us to judge accurately of the Roman tragedian's criticism of his nation's policy with regard to the victims of its warfare. We can, however, imagine that the opportunities offered for pathetic treatment of the inhumanity of warfare and the glad blessing of mercy by such *fabulae praetextae* as the *Ambracia* and *Sabinae* of Ennius, and the *Paulus* of Pacuvius,<sup>20</sup> were not overlooked. To be sure, the record of Roman armies does not argue for a compassionate character in the Roman,<sup>21</sup> but we should hesitate for that reason to pass an adverse judgment on the Roman's sense of pity, though it is no doubt true that the very continuity of Rome's wars inured her citizens to cruelty, as Cicero, recalling a day when the Roman people was considered merciful to its foes, observes that in his time domestic cruelty by long use had taken from even the gentlest souls their capacity for pity.<sup>22</sup> Finally,

<sup>16</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1370 b 1-7. At *Poet.* 1455 a 2 f. Aristotle uses the scene in which Odysseus weeps as he is reminded of the past by the song of Demodocus to illustrate a type of *ἀναγνώσις*.

<sup>17</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1381 a 1-3. <sup>18</sup> Aristotle, *Pol.* 1342 a 11-15.

<sup>19</sup> So Miss Steuart, *op. cit.*, V, 2, followed by Warmington, I, p. 62, line 169.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Livy, XLV, 7-8, and Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.*, 27.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. W. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome*, p. 208.

<sup>22</sup> Cicero, *Pro Rosc. Am.*, 154:

vestrum nemo est quin intellegat populum Romanum, qui quondam in hostes lenissimus existimabatur, hoc tempore domestica crudelitate laborare. . . . quae . . . hominibus lenissimis ademit misericordiam consuetudine incommodorum. nam cum omnibus horis aliquid atrociter fieri videmus aut audimus, etiam qui natura mitissimi sumus, assiduitate molestiarum sensum omnem humanitatis ex animis amittimus.

it must be remarked that, whether with compassion or not, Rome's absorption of subject peoples necessarily involved a policy generally more lenient than that she adopted in particular instances: hence Vergil's *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, Horace's *iacentem | lenis in hostem*, and much earlier Ennius' *qui vicit non est victor nisi victus fatetur*; <sup>23</sup> and hence too the avowed humanity of Caesar and the boasted mercy of Augustus.<sup>24</sup>

"There are many with hearts of stone who pity none," says a fragment of Ennius' *Erechtheus*.<sup>25</sup> And though the Roman applauded the grand rhetoric of Atreus' cruelty, as Cicero tells us,<sup>26</sup> he condemned cruelty generally, and found it easier to believe his enemy guilty of it than himself. Cicero achieves a rhetorical contrast between Hannibal's respectful award of funeral rites to Marcellus, and his conventional attribute, *crudelissimus*.<sup>27</sup> The Phoenicians were wont to sacrifice their children to the gods;<sup>28</sup> the Phoenicians commit atrocities on the field of battle.<sup>29</sup> And by an extension of such self-satisfaction the Roman could feel with the Greek the barbarity of the Thracian Tereus,<sup>30</sup> or with the Trojan the contrast between Greek cruelty and Trojan humanity.<sup>31</sup> If the Roman did not then feel so strongly as the writer of a recent article who speaks of

<sup>23</sup> Vergil, *Aen.*, VI, 853; Horace, *C. S.*, 51 f.; Ennius, *Annales*, 485 W. Cf. Publilius Syrus, 367 R.: *misericors civis patriae est consolatio*; 475 R.: *potens misericors publica est felicitas*; 500 R.: *perpetuo vincit qui utitur clementia*.

<sup>24</sup> Caesar, *B. G.*, II, 28; *B. C.*, I, 72, 3; *Monumentum Ancyranum*, 3. For Augustus' acts of clemency see note of Owen on Ovid, *Trist.*, II, 43. For pity in modern warfare cf. Pierre van Paasen, *Days of Our Years* (1938), p. 66: "I have never heard of a single case of chivalry or pity towards the enemy, either in the Great War, or in the subsequent campaigns in Syria, Ethiopia and Spain which I followed as a correspondent."

<sup>25</sup> Ennius, *trag. fr.*, 144 W. Cf. Pease, . . . *Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, on *Aen.*, IV, 366.

<sup>26</sup> Cicero, *De Off.*, I, 97.

<sup>27</sup> Cicero, *De Sen.*, 75.

<sup>28</sup> Ennius, *Annales*, 237 W. Moloch is meant, probably. See note of Pearson, Sophocles, *fr.* 126.

<sup>29</sup> Ennius, *Annales*, 282 W.

<sup>30</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 639 W.: *indomito more atque animo barbaro*.

<sup>31</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 568 W.: *Phrygiam miti more esse, animo inmani Graeciam*. Cf. Accius, *trag. fr.*, 147 W.: *quorum crudelitatem numquam ulla explet satias sanguinis*.

the "one great quality in which our world is immeasurably and unmistakably better than it was at any period before . . . the quality of mercy,"<sup>32</sup> he was conscious of a long struggle upwards from savage and lawless barbarity to a gentler condition of civilization, a progress which he found expressed in such a line as the following from Accius' *Medea sive Argonautae: primo ex inmani victum ad mansuetum applicans.*<sup>33</sup> Lucretius' account of this progress is noteworthy for the emphasis it gives to the part played by compassion in civilizing man. With housing, clothing, fireside, and family, man became a tamer creature, till, losing his primitive lusts in his new-found marital happiness, and beguiled by the blandishments of his children, he made a compact with his neighbor for their mutual protection from each other and for the safe-keeping of their wives and children. And though his speech was still a series of gestures and stammering sounds he hit upon the idea that it is right for all to have pity on the weak: *imbecillorum esse aecum misererier omnis.*<sup>34</sup> Cicero seems to have much the same thought in mind when he says: *etenim iustitiae non natura nec voluntas sed imbecillitas mater est.* But he generally omits *misericordia* from the list of qualities which make up the common bond that holds society together.<sup>35</sup> This omission may in part be due to his deference to the Stoic doctrine that pity like the other passions is eschewed by the wise man.<sup>36</sup> In several places in the orations, however, Cicero does refer to pity as a factor in this common bond, as well as to *humanitas* in its special sense of humane feeling.<sup>37</sup> In the oration *pro Ligario*<sup>38</sup> he says that none of Caesar's virtues is more admirable or more welcome than his *misericordia*, and adds

<sup>32</sup> Francis Burgess, "The Discovery of Pity," *Quarterly Review*, CCLXVII (1936), p. 282.

<sup>33</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 400 W.

<sup>34</sup> Lucretius, V, 1023.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Fin.*, V, 65; *De Off.*, I, 20, 42, 50, 53; *Pro Flac.*, 62; *Pro Quinct.*, 51; *Pro Rosc. Am.*, 63. Cf. also Siegfried Lorenz, *De Progressu Notionis ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΑΣ* (Lipsiae, Weidae Thuringorum, Thomas et Hubert, 1914), pp. 51-53.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.*, IV, 18, 41 ff.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Pro Rosc. Am.*, 154 (cited *supra*, note 22); *Pro Quinct.*, 97: . . . *obsecravit . . . ut aliquando misericordiam caperet, aliquam si non propinquitatis, at aetatis suae, si non hominis, at humanitatis rationem haberet . . .*; cf. also *Ad Q. Fr.*, I, 1, 21; *Pro Mur.*, 62-66.

<sup>38</sup> §§ 37 f.

the general remark: *homines enim ad deos nulla re propius accedunt quam salutem hominibus dando.*<sup>39</sup>

Aristotle declares that the proper hero of tragedy is illustrious in rank and fortune,<sup>40</sup> a requirement which it has been suggested is designed to make the catastrophe more impressive.<sup>41</sup> In a passage cited above<sup>42</sup> Cicero mentions as particularly pleasing to a reader the *temporum varietates fortunaeque vicissitudines*. And again, explaining the ease with which Mithridates after his defeat by Lucullus gathered another army about him, Cicero observes that it is not unusual for the downcast fortunes of kings to move the pity and attract the resources of many men, especially of those who from the circumstance that they are themselves kings or live in kingdoms regard the name of king as something great and sacred.<sup>43</sup> Further, the idea that reverses of fortune arouse pity is suggested in Pausanias' report of the Altar of Pity at Athens. For Pausanias says that the Athenians alone among Greeks honor Eleos as being especially beneficent towards the affairs of mankind and their vicissitudes.<sup>44</sup> By chance one of the fragments of Accius' *Telephus* touches on this theme: *nam is demum miser est, cuius nobilitas miserias | nobilitat,* "He is really unfortunate whose high rank makes his misfortunes widely known."<sup>45</sup> Another fragment of Accius less

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the line of Caecilius, *fr.* 257 W.: *homo homini deus est si suum officium sciāt.* Cf. also Otto, *Sprichwörter d. R.*, s. v., "deus," and P. Faider, "Le Poète Cécilius," *Musée Belge*, XIII (1909), pp. 24 f. Caecilius' line is apparently a reflection of a Greek proverb (Leutsch and Schneidewin, I, p. 29, 12-14): *ἀνθρώπος ἀνθρώπου δαιμόνιον.*

<sup>40</sup> *Poet.* 1453 a 9.

<sup>41</sup> S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Arts*,<sup>4</sup> p. 304.

<sup>42</sup> See note 11, *supra*.

<sup>43</sup> Cicero, *Pro Manil.*, 24. Where noble rank is wanting courage can make shift. So Cicero says, *Pro Mil.*, 92, that spectators are more likely to pity a courageous gladiator than one who begs for pity. Adam Smith remarks (*Theory of Moral Sentiments* [Philadelphia, 1817], pp. 225 f.): "The fall from riches to poverty, as it commonly occasions the most real distress to the sufferer, so it seldom fails to excite the most sincere commiseration in the spectator."

<sup>44</sup> Pausanias, I, 17, 1: . . . 'Ελέου βωμός, ω μάλιστα θεῶν ἐσ ἀνθρώπινον βίον καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγμάτων ὄντι ωφελίμω μόνοι τιμᾶς 'Ελλήνων νέμουσιν 'Αθηναῖοι.

<sup>45</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 627-8 W. = 621-2 R. The text is uncertain. Ribbeck reads *nam huius demum miseret*, etc. With either text the frag-

directly illustrates the greater pitiableness inspired by true nobility of mien or manner. Assigned to the *Astyianax*, it may, as conjectured, be Agamemnon's or another Greek general's confession that he is moved to pity by the exalted dignity of countenance of his captive Andromache: <sup>46</sup> *abducite intro, nam mihi miseritudine | commovit animum excelsa aspecti dignitas.*

Another stimulus to pity is the spectacle of death, and again it is helpful to note Schopenhauer's remark that the tears shed in the presence of death spring not only from the thought of the deceased's fate, nor only from pity of the mortality that awaits all mankind's high efforts, but even more from pity of oneself and one's own death to come.<sup>47</sup> This last is the self-pity for what shall be that Lucretius declares to be irrational.<sup>48</sup> In a passage of similar purport Cicero quotes from a scene in Pacuvius' *Iliona*,<sup>49</sup> a scene in which the ghost of Iliona's murdered son appears and, reproaching her for sleeping, says that she has no pity on him, and bids her rise and bury him, urging further that his remains be not allowed to rot in the ground. Cicero's use of the passage is not sympathetic, to be sure, but he does tell us that the lines were sung to subdued and tearful modes so effectively that they set entire audiences weeping. By way of further illustration of Lucretius' self-pitying man we may recall the satisfaction Simo derives from the tears which he believed his son shed for the death of the Andrian woman with whom he was only casually acquainted, as it occurred to him how much more the boy would grieve for his own father's death.<sup>50</sup> So comforting is the prospect of this pity that a fragment of the *Vidularia* of Plautus ironically suggests that it is better to be dead and be mourned by good men than to live and be mocked by bad

ment suits my purpose here, though whether the emphasis is on the high rank of the sufferer or the widely spread knowledge of his suffering is obscured by the paronomasia. Cf. also Plautus, *Epid.*, 526: *si quid est homini miseriarum quod miserescat, miser ex animo est.* Cf. further Caecilius, fr. 136 f. W.: *Is demum miser est qui aerumnam suam nesciat occultare | foris.*

<sup>46</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 151-2 W.

<sup>47</sup> Schopenhauer, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 484 f. (= *Die Welt als Wille u. Vorstellung*, § 67).

<sup>48</sup> Lucretius, II, 879-911.

<sup>49</sup> Cicero, *Tusc.*, I, 106; Pacuvius, *trag. fr.*, 205-210 W.

<sup>50</sup> Terence, *Andria*, 110-112.

men.<sup>51</sup> But, though pity of the dead by the living is the more familiar motif,<sup>52</sup> a tender elegiac couplet of the Sullan period is a request that the deceased take pity on the bereaved survivor and permit their reunion in the world beyond:

Sei quid amor valeat nostei sei te hominem scis,  
Commiseresce mei, da veniam ut veniam.<sup>53</sup>

Expressions of pity in Roman drama vary in tone from sudden and not very stirring declarations of sympathy to the pity that chokes with tears the voice of one of the characters of Pacuvius' *Iliona*.<sup>54</sup> The former passages can be passed over here<sup>55</sup> save to remark the mocking retort which an expression of pity encounters in Plautus' *Curculio*. Just as Curculio closes the deal with the pimp Cappadox for the girl Planesium, Cappadox ostentatiously requests that the girl be well taken care of. "If you pity her," asks Curculio, "how much are you willing to contribute to her future well-being?"<sup>56</sup> Cappadox drops his pose with a curse, and the humor lies, to be sure, in the absurdity of supposing that the conventionally godless and heartless pimp, a *homo inhumanissimus*,<sup>57</sup> could under any circumstances feel pity. At the other extreme in tone is the scene in Accius' *Meleager* in which Althea, resolved to cast the brand into the fire and so end her son's life, struggles for a moment with her motherly love and murmurs: *Nunc si me matrem mansues misericordia | capsit*.<sup>58</sup> We are reminded of the strife in Medea's breast be-

<sup>51</sup> Plautus, *Vid.*, fr. XV: *malim moriri meos quam mendicarier: | boni miserantur illum, hunc inrident mali.*

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Buecheler, *C. L. E.*, 82, 8: *infunde lacrimas, quisquis es, mihi misericors.* Cf. also Clara Louise Thompson, *Tedium Vitae in Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions* (St. Louis, 1911), pp. 3-5; J. A. Tolman, Jr., *Study of Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's C. E. L.* (U. of Chi. Press, 1910), p. 6.

<sup>53</sup> *C. I. L.*<sup>2</sup>, I, 2540 c. Cf. also C. L. Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-16.

<sup>54</sup> Pacuvius, *trag. fr.*, 228 W.: *miseret me, lacrimis lingua debiliter stupet.*

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Pacuvius, *incert. fr.*, 19 W.: *cepisti me istoc verbo, miseretur tui.* Cf. also Plautus, *Bacch.*, 1044, *Cist.*, 769, *Most.*, 985, *Pers.*, 639, *Vid.*, 69-71; Terence, *Phorm.*, 501, *And.*, 869, *Eun.*, 802.

<sup>56</sup> Plautus, *Curc.*, 518 f.: *si huius miseret, | ecquid das qui bene sit?* Cf. for a similar breaking of a pose, Plautus, *Poen.*, 150 f.

<sup>57</sup> Terence, *Phorm.*, 508. Cf. Plautus, *Pseud.*, 308, 378; Terence, *Phorm.*, 497 f., 520-522; Plautus, *Rud.*, 485 f.

<sup>58</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 446-7 W.

tween her resolution and her maternal pity, and of course the *Meleager* is derived from Euripides' play of that name. Ennius' *Hecuba*, also modeled after Euripides' play, offers among its extant fragments one in which Hecuba, having just heard that her daughter Polyxena is to be slain, asks for pity for the old woman that she is, and a sword with which to slay herself.<sup>59</sup> And from another of Ennius' adaptations of Euripides, the *Alexander*, Cicero preserves a considerable fragment in which Cassandra, foreseeing all Troy's tale of woe, cried out: *Mea mater, tui me miseret, mei piget.* Cicero, quoting the fragment for a purpose, is moved to interrupt himself and exclaim: *O poema tenerum et moratum atque molle.*<sup>60</sup> Ennius' *Hectoris Lytra* is thought to have been formed from three different plays of Aeschylus, and thus to have covered the whole story of the *Iliad*. One of its fragments contains Priam's plea for pity to the Myrmidons keeping guard before Achilles' tent.<sup>61</sup> An unplaced fragment of Accius' *Epinausimache* offers Achilles' admission that he pities the hard-pressed Argives.<sup>62</sup> And an unassigned fragment of Pacuvius, imitated by Vergil, Ovid, and Terence, describes someone as so pitiable that even Priam would pity him, Priam, who would as his enemy be the least likely to pity him.<sup>63</sup>

One of Accius' coinages in *-udo* is the word *miseritudo*.<sup>64</sup> The text of a fragment in the *Astyanax* in which this word appears is uncertain, but Ribbeck's suggestion is plausible.<sup>65</sup> Accepting it, we may imagine a number of survivors of the city's fall, Aeneas probably and his followers, returning to the ruins, and in grand pity of their one-time stronghold, bravely reciting its past glories to each other. There are, to be sure, a number of

<sup>59</sup> Ennius, *trag. fr.*, 204-5 W.

<sup>60</sup> Cicero, *De Div.*, I, 66; Ennius, *trag. fr.*, 63 W.

<sup>61</sup> Ennius, *trag. fr.*, 198 W.

<sup>62</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 317 W. The text is corrupt, but, supposing Havet's text to be correct, the line probably represents the mood of Achilles as he began to accept the idea of letting Patroclus go to the fray among the ships. It should then be placed near the beginning of the play.

<sup>63</sup> Pacuvius, *incert. fr.*, 10 W.: *Priamus si adesset, ipse eius commisereseret.* Cf. Vergil, *Aen.*, XI, 259; II, 6; Ovid, *Met.*, XIV, 474; Terence, *Hec.*, 128 f.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. the list given by F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, p. 403, n. 1. An instance of the word appears *supra*, note 46.

<sup>65</sup> Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.*, p. 416. The fragment is Accius, *trag. fr.*, 149-150 W.

fragments which, like this one, tease the imagination to furnish them with fitting settings. Another of the three instances of *miseritudo* may come from a lament of Phegeus in Accius' *Alpheisboea* for children pitilessly slain.<sup>66</sup> And from the play which Aesopus used to stir the Roman public to weep over the exile of Cicero,<sup>67</sup> the *Eurysaces*,<sup>68</sup> a character says, "As I called to mind how alone you were and feared for you my concern for you was more than my pity of myself."<sup>69</sup> A group of these fragments contains mention of pitiable conditions, such as tearfulness and bereavement,<sup>70</sup> poverty, exile, and old age.<sup>71</sup>

One of the most familiar kinds of pity, the pity of a god for a mortal, is suggested but once in the Republican dramatic fragments, and in that instance it probably means simply: "We're finally having some luck."<sup>72</sup>

In Accius' *Athamas* the protagonist despairs of meeting with a pity he does not deserve.<sup>73</sup> The idea that to meet with compassion one must show compassion is a commonplace. A line buried in the elder Seneca's *Controversiae* and accepted as a verse from an early Latin comedy warns us that a man often asks for pity who had the opportunity to show pity. Two of the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus are to the same effect.<sup>74</sup> But the best example of this topic is the declaration of Hegias in Plautus' *Captivi* (765) that he is determined to pity none, since none pities him. So too Pseudolus is not at first inclined to be moved by the suppliant attitude of Simo, as he reflects that if *he* had lost their wager his back would have met with no mercy.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 42 W. Cf. Turpilius, 54 R.: *ni Callifonis nunc te miseret liberum.*

<sup>67</sup> Cicero, *Pro Sest.*, 120.

<sup>68</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 349-350 W.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Turpilius, 55 R.: *quam matris nunc patris me miseretur magis.*

<sup>70</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 54 W.: *miseret lacrimarum luctuum orbitudinis.*  
Cf. Turpilius, 211 R.: *hoc te oro, ut illius commiserescas miserulae orbitudinis.*

<sup>71</sup> Pacuvius, *trag. fr.*, 328 W. Cf. Accius, *trag. fr.*, 48 W.

<sup>72</sup> Afranius, 417 R.: *nescio qui nostri miseritust tandem deus.* Cf. Menander, *Arbitrants*, 659 (Allinson).

<sup>73</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 160 W.

<sup>74</sup> *Trag. incert.*, 93 R.: *saepe qui misereri potuit, rogitat misericordiam.*  
Publilius Syrus, 329 R.: *misereri scire sine periclo est vivere; idem,*  
206 R.: *homo qui in homine calamitoso est misericors meminit sui.*

<sup>75</sup> Plautus, *Pseud.*, 1324: *neque te mei tergi misereret hoc sei non hodie ecfecissem.*

Related to this topic is the pitilessness of the *meretrix* of comedy. She is moved to pity her suppliant not by his tears but by what he pays.<sup>76</sup> Thus her "pity" is but her final consent, and so resembles somewhat the technical pity of the court-room, where to take pity on the defendant is to acquit him.<sup>77</sup> The *locus classicus* is the first scene of Terence's *Hecyra* (63-87). Philotis, a young and inexperienced *meretrix*, relates her surprise at hearing that Pamphilus has married, though he swore to Bacchis that he would not marry during her lifetime. Syra, an older courtesan, is not surprised, and remarks that this sort of thing is her reason for urging Philotis never to let pity of any man deter her from ruining him. "Shouldn't I have one special lover?" asks Philotis. Syra's answer is that she should make no exception, since she can be sure that no man will come to her with any purpose other than to have his pleasure as cheaply as possible. The same spirit animates a monologue in Plautus' *Truculentus* (223 ff.).

The interplay of pity and love exists, however, on a less practical plane, and we may recall that it was in part the tale of his misfortunes that moved Dido with the first blush of love for Aeneas.<sup>78</sup> The *Andromeda* of Ennius probably presented a development of love out of pity, as did its model, Euripides' *Andromeda*,<sup>79</sup> the fragments of which contain Cepheus' plea to Perseus for sympathy (119 N.), Perseus' first cry of pity for the maiden in distress (127 N.), Andromeda's appeal for pity (128 N.), Perseus' unchivalrous attempt to get a promise of love from the girl before he rescues her (129 N.), and, anticipating Aristotle, his rationalization of his pity as a feeling arising from his fears for himself (130 N.), and lastly the girl's impatience with his promises. The Perseus of Accius' *Andromeda* seems from the fragments to have acted more chivalrously.<sup>80</sup> A plainer case of pity becoming love is the story in Terence's *Hecyra* of the gradual transference of Pamphilus' affection from his mistress

<sup>76</sup> Publilius Syrus, 358 R.: *muneribus, non lacrimis, meretrix est misericors.*

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Starkie's note on Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 880.

<sup>78</sup> Vergil, *Aen.*, IV, 13 f.: *heu, quibus ille | iactatus fatis! quae bella exhausta canebat!*

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Ribbeck's reconstruction, *Röm. Trag.*, pp. 164-176.

<sup>80</sup> See Tenney Frank, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, pp. 44 f.

to his wife, a transfer caused mainly by the noble conduct of the wife during their separation and the pity such conduct aroused in her husband.<sup>81</sup> In Terence's *Andria* the old father, as we have seen, was disappointed to find out that his son's apparent pity was not pity at all, but love; yet pity is an important part of the young man's love, as subsequent passages in the play reveal.<sup>82</sup> Again, in the *Phormio* of Terence, the pitiable circumstances of the orphaned girl heighten her beauty and cause Antipho to fall in love with her at sight (91-110). Terence's description of the girl's plight is a *miseratio*, and later, when Phaedria undertakes to defend Antipho to Antipho's father, he suggests that the court order for Antipho to marry the orphan was secured by the *commiseratio* of the plaintiff's speech in the courtroom, and asks whether in that case the blame is his or the judges': *qui saepe propter invidiam adimunt diviti | aut propter misericordiam addunt pauperi.*<sup>83</sup> Similar *miserationes* are Aeschinus' plea (Terence, *Adelphoe*, 662 ff.) in behalf of the girl his father Micio pretends to have treated unjustly, and the plea of Lysiteles in behalf of Lesbonicus in Plautus' *Trinummus* (326-358).

In the latter passage, Philto cautions his son against prolonging another's misery in the act of being compassionate to him (339 f.), and against letting one's pity of others reduce oneself to pitiable circumstances (343). This counsel of caution is found in a number of passages in Roman comedy. Periplectomenus, the astute old epicure of the *Miles Gloriosus*, has no children because, he says, they would cause him too much mental torture (718-722). In the *Mostellaria* Theopropides, who likes to talk in proverbs, says that charity begins at home, and that a man should refrain from pitying others.<sup>84</sup> In Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos* Chremes, having just discovered that his wife many years before had disobeyed him in handing over her new-born girl to an old woman of Corinth instead of exposing it to die, is particularly vexed at his wife's deception, but admits that she may fairly appeal to her motherly love and compassion

<sup>81</sup> Terence, *Hec.*, 164-168.

<sup>82</sup> *Andria*, 125 f., 260-263, 277-280.

<sup>83</sup> *Phormio*, 276 f. Cf. also 357 f.

<sup>84</sup> *Most.*, 799: *sibi quisque ruri metit*; 802, *misericordia se abstinere hominem oportet* (*abstinere* is conjectural).

(637) : *at id omitto: misericordia, animus maternus: sino.* And in the lines following he makes it clear that it is not the quality of mercy that he condemns so much as the thoughtlessness and selfishness of a sudden act apparently merciful, but really cruel, since it preserved the girl for a life that to Chremes' way of thinking was worse than none. The crueler course here would have been the kinder one.

The greater susceptibility of women than men to pity, illustrated in the passage just cited, is a commonplace that figures largely today in the masculine-feminine tests of psychologists.<sup>85</sup> A fragment of Pacuvius gives tears to women: *fletus muliebri ingenio additust.*<sup>86</sup> These are the tears of self-pity to which Philodemus refers when he writes of women that "they think it proper that their natural weakness be pitied, that they be readily forgiven, and that they be not of set purpose abused by those stronger than themselves; whence it is that they readily break into tears, supposing that they are reproved because they are disdained."<sup>87</sup> The use of pity as a weapon is one of the recognized artifices of the *meretrix*.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, woman's tenderness is well depicted in a fragment of Accius which tells how Antigona went about caring for the wounded: . . . *omnis saucios | convisit ut curentur diligentius.* Accius has made Antigona more of a Florence Nightingale than she had been in the play he imitated.<sup>89</sup> The priestess of Plautus' *Rudens* boasts that no woman is more commiserate than she (281), and an experienced courtesan in Plautus' *Cistellaria* is at least tender-hearted.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>85</sup> See L. M. Terman and C. C. Miles, *Sex and Personality* (New York and London, 1936), pp. 2, 391, 392, 399-401, and 413-415.

<sup>86</sup> Pacuvius, *trag. fr.*, 295. Cf. Euripides, *Medea*, 928: *γυνὴ δὲ θῆλυ κάπι δακρύοις ἔφυ.* Cf. also Sophocles, *Trach.*, 1070 ff.

<sup>87</sup> Philodemus, *Περὶ παρηγότας* (Teubner, 1914), 11.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Turpilius, 29-30 R.; Terence, *Andria*, 558-560. Cf. also Lucian, *Tox.*, 15, and *Anth. Pal.*, V, 186, quoted by Keith Preston, *Studies in the Diction of the Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy* (U. of Chi. Libraries, 1916), p. 24. Cf. also Shakespeare, *King Lear*, II, iv, 277 f.: "And let not women's weapons, water-drops, | Stain my man's cheeks!"

<sup>89</sup> Accius, *trag. fr.*, 600-601 W. Cf. Warmington's note here on Euripides, *Phoen.*, 1476 f.

<sup>90</sup> Lines 58 and 112. Cf. also the quite proper squeamishness of a courtesan at Terence, *Eun.*, 945 f.

A number of minor topics of pity must be passed over here.<sup>91</sup> Not a few of the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus are concerned with pity. Where they illustrate topics of pity which I have mentioned, I have generally relegated them to footnotes. A few of them are better adapted to study in connection with the *com-miseratio* of Roman oratory, as, e. g. (77 R.) *bona comparat praesidia misericordia*; (312 R.) *mala causa est quae requirit misercordiam*.

These topics of pity, considered as a group and for all that they are disparate in tone and literary value, form a chapter in the history of pity the full import of which will be more evident when they are compared with the uses of pity in Greek epic and dramatic literature on the one hand, and on the other with the treatments to be found in the historical and poetical literature of the Roman Empire. Such comparisons are, however, save for passing comments interspersed above, beyond the scope of this paper.<sup>92</sup> That the Roman tragedy of the Republican period is almost entirely drawn from Greek classical tragedy, as is Roman comedy from the New Comedy, may be fairly accepted as patent. But we have no assurance that the study of any particular topic in Greek tragedy would be a more direct and easier way of ascertaining the incidence of such a topic in Roman tragedy. Fragmentary though they be, we had best take little for granted about the remains of Roman drama, and adhere to the evidence offered. It is remarkable, I think, that there is so much evidence of a concern with the topics of pity in such scanty remains.

EDWARD B. STEVENS.

HILLSDALE COLLEGE.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. for self-pity: Plautus, *Merc.*, 335 f.; Terence, *Hec.*, 281 f. and 293. For ironic pity cf. Plautus, *Amph.*, 297. For boisterous or comic pity cf. Plautus, *Stich.*, 329 f. and Plautus, *fr.*, 57. For the sympathetic fallacy (a merciful sea) see Plautus, *Trin.*, 825-827; and for the "unsympathetic" fallacy, Accius, *trag. fr.*, 238 W.: *flucti immisericordes* (see Pease, *Cl. Journ.*, XXII [1927], pp. 651-654). For a slave's pity of his mistress' pain in childbirth, see Caecilius, 156 W., and Terence, *Adelph.*, 306-308.

<sup>92</sup> I plan to treat other divisions of the history of pity in future studies.

## HORACE, *ODES*, II, 7, 9-10.

Horace's words, addressed to his friend Pompey:

Tecum Philippos et celerem fugam  
sensi relicta non bene parmula

(*Odes*, II, 7, 9-10) have evoked a good deal of discussion as to their proper evaluation. Is the statement that Horace lost his shield at the battle of Philippi an imitation of Greek models, or is it a true account of his own experience? Obviously the judgment of Horace's behavior and character depends on the answer to that question. Yet no solution has been generally agreed upon. I therefore propose once more to discuss the reasons given for the various interpretations and to reexamine the meaning of the sentence and the situation which it describes.<sup>1</sup>

The usual attitude is to take Horace's statement as an imitation of Greek examples. It is clear, most commentators say, that the passage is no portraiture of what happened at Philippi but a literary commonplace which Horace uses, recalling the three great lyric poets, Alcaeus, Anacreon, and Archilochus, who in their poems told of having thrown away their shields. Now the verses of Alcaeus are not preserved; it is only known that he lost his arms and sent a poem on the subject to a friend.<sup>2</sup> Anacreon threw away his shield and, he says, fled like a cuckoo;

<sup>1</sup> Much, almost too much has been written on the subject. It is quite understandable that L. Castiglioni says (*Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti* [Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche], LXX [1937], p. 59): "Cetera mitto, de quibus ad taedium satietatemque iam diu disputatum est, gesseritne parmulam Horatius, abieceritne eam an deposuerit, gloriatusne sit an rei turpissimae puditus ioco gravissima occultare voluerit, eandem denique scuti reverentiam quam Graeci Romani habuerint neene, aliaque multa, quae stomachum partim movent, partim risum. . ." Yet to the biographer of Horace, as well as to the interpreter of his work, the problem is too interesting to be left in suspense.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, V, 95: πολεμέοντων δέ σφεων παντοῖα καὶ ἄλλα ἐγένετο ἐν τῇσι μάχησι, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Ἀλκαῖος δὲ ποιητὴς συμβολῆς γενομένης καὶ νικῶντων Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸς μὲν φεύγων ἐκφεύγει, τὰ δέ οἱ ὅπλα ἵσχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ σφεα ἀνεκρέμασαν πρὸς τὸ Ἀθήναιον τὸ ἐν Σιγείῳ. ταῦτα δὲ Ἀλκαῖος ἐν μέλει ποιῆσας ἐπιτιθεῖ ἐς Μυτιλήνην ἔξαγγελλόμενος τὸ ἑωντοῦ πάθος Μελανίππῳ ἀνδρὶ ἐταίρῳ.

why he did so or how he felt about his misfortune, he does not tell.<sup>3</sup> Archilochus, who alone is explicit about the whole affair, asserts that he left his shield unwillingly (*οὐκ ἐθέλων*) and that he feels sure of getting another, and not a worse one, in due time.<sup>4</sup> Horace's statement differs greatly from Archilochus' defiant spirit. He admits that he lost his shield, and that he lost it ignominiously (*non bene*). This, as far as can be ascertained, none of the Greek poets asserts of himself. The simple citation of literary parallels then fails to explain the characterization which Horace gives of his conduct; the peculiar evaluation which he makes of the event cannot be understood as a mere imitation of Greek models.<sup>5</sup>

Besides, even if one were willing to accept as negligible Horace's change of the patterns which he is supposed to follow, one has to ask why he uses such a topic and why he pictures himself as behaving worse than he really did. The commentators do not discuss at all Horace's intention in writing these verses; they treat the poet as if he were a mere translator of Greek passages. The only one to consider the purpose which Horace might have had is Lessing.<sup>6</sup> He was of the opinion that these words are meant to be sarcastic; he stated that one who does not speak in earnest likes to portray himself in a way different from that in which he really behaved. Lessing's chief reason for his assumption of mocking imitation is found in Horace's claim

<sup>3</sup> Anacreon, frag. 51 (Diehl) : *ἀσπίδα ρῖψ' ἐς ποταμοῦ καλλιρέον προχοάς*; and frag. 60 (Diehl) : *ἐγὼ δ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς φύγω ὥστε κόκκυξ*. It is not certain that these fragments belong together and really describe the experience of Anacreon (cf. Heinze [*Qu. H. Flaccus, Oden und Epoden erklaert von E. Kiessling*, erneuert von R. Heinze, Berlin, 1917] *ad v. 10*); it is not even certain that frag. 60 (Diehl) refers to an experience in war (cf. frag. 26 [Diehl]); the seventh edition of Heinze's commentary therefore does not consider frag. 60 at all.

<sup>4</sup> Archilochus, frag. 6 (Diehl) : *ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἦν παρὰ θάμνῳ / ἔντος ἀμώμητον κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων./ αὐτὸς δ' ἔξεφυγον θανάτου τέλος. ἀσπὶς ἑκείνη· ἐρρέτω· ἔξαντις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω*. Heinze emphasizes the fact (*ad v. 10*) that Philippi lies near the city of Saïs. If this argument is of any value at all it makes the difference between the original and the imitation even more noteworthy. See also note 8, *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> The importance of the words *non bene* has been correctly emphasized by N. Salanitro, *Il Mondo Classico*, VI (1936), p. 402; see also note 22, *infra*.

<sup>6</sup> G. E. Lessing, *Rettungen des Horaz, Saemtliche Schriften*, ed. K. Lachman, IV (1835), pp. 27 f.

that he had been saved by Mercury.<sup>7</sup> To be sure, this claim is not literally true; but is it only a jest? In verses which are undoubtedly serious, Horace says:

Vestrīs amicūm fontibūs et choribūs  
non me Philippis versā acies retro,  
devotā non extinxit arbor,  
nec Sicula Palinurus unda. (*Odes*, III, 4, 25-28)

These words express Horace's belief that in the three great dangers which he had experienced he had been saved by divine intervention. In the poem sent to Pompey he says the same thing. At Philippi in extreme peril of his life he had, by the aid of God, been removed from imminent destruction. Whether, by this statement, Horace is referring to the Olympian Mercury, his patron god, or to Augustus, whom he believes to be an incarnation of Mercury,<sup>8</sup> his words can surely not be meant as a joke. On this basis it is not possible to vindicate other remarks as being ironic.

Besides, the tone of the whole poem is grave; the verses deal with experiences shared by the poet and the friend to whom the ode is presented. Horace begins with a reminder of the deadly perils which he, together with his companion, had so often to face. This is the first thought which occurs to him when he greets Pompey, who has at last been brought home by good fate (1-4). True, Pompey is not only the fellow soldier; he is also the foremost of his mates of old, the comrade with whom he spent so many pleasant days when they were young (5-8). Yet

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 29 and p. 30: "Kurz, die ganze siebende Ode des zweyten Buches ist nichts als ein Scherz."

<sup>8</sup> Mercury as the patron god of Horace: Heinze, *ad Od.* I, 10; *Od.* II, 17, 29; Augustus identified with Mercury: *Od.* I, 2, 44 (cf. also K. Scott, *Hermes*, LXIII [1928], pp. 15 f.). *Ode* II, 7 was probably written after 29 B. C.; I, 2 probably in the winter 28-27 (cf. Heinze's introduction to these poems). Th. Zielinski, on the evidence of Horace's poem, has suggested that Archilochus too was saved by Mercury (*Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, Serie Quarta, Scienze Filologiche, VII [1927], p. 605). If this restoration of the Archilochus monument is correct—it is certainly possible (cf. the new edition of the monument by F. Hiller v. Gaertringen, *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Philolog.-hist. Kl., I, 2 [1934], p. 49)—it would serve to confirm the notion that Horace agrees with his Greek examples only in such instances in which his personal experience and belief allow him to do so.

the remembrance of the golden time of youth is immediately superseded by the recollection of the hardship which the friends had to suffer later on.<sup>9</sup> The war broke out; soon both found themselves in the most critical situation of their lives, the battle of Philippi. There they fought together, and together they saw the defeat (9-12). Afterward, however, they were separated. Horace was honorably discharged from the army<sup>10</sup> and returned to the fatherland; Pompey for a long time remained engaged in warfare (13-16). Now, finally, he too comes home, no longer a soldier, an enemy of Augustus, an outlaw, but a citizen once more, who wishes to live in peace and quiet. Horace asks him to offer sacrifices and thanks to God, to try to drown in Lethe the sorrows of the past, drinking the wine which he has treasured up for him all these years. He himself will celebrate the return of his friend with joy so intense that it approaches ecstasy (17-28).<sup>11</sup> That is the content of the stanzas. In such an ode it seems hardly possible to resort to facetious self-abasement in explanation of one single feature. Yet, so far as I can see, there is no other possibility of understanding Horace's statement about the abandonment of his shield, once it is supposed to be a mere imitation of Greek examples.

It seems, therefore, that the lines must be presumed to report a fact. Horace must actually have abandoned his shield at Philippi and have behaved ignominiously. But is it not strange that he should have done so? For such behavior would be in contradiction to all that Horace tells about his military service in his other poems. Although by nature he has no liking for warfare and although he does not have a very strong constitution (*imbellis ac firmus parum*, *Epod.*, I, 16), he has always done his duty. That in war as well as in peace he satisfied the demands of the first men of the city is one of the virtues by which he overcame the stain of his mean birth (*me libertino natum patre, et in tenui re / maiores pennas nido extendisse loqueris, / ut quantum generi demas virtutibus addas; / me primis urbis belli placuisse domique*, *Epist.*, I, 20, 20-24). Horace may have been

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Heinze *ad v.* 5: ". . . Erinnerung an die Symposien des sorglosen athenischen Studentenlebens . . . welche in wirkungsvollem Gegensatz zu den vorher und nachher erwähnten Leiden stehn."

<sup>10</sup> Lessing, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>11</sup> The word ecstasy is customarily reserved by the poet for the experience of deep emotion and passion; cf. Heinze *ad v.* 26.

the more proud of his achievements because, as he says rather ironically, the poet is usually not of much worth in war even if he is a useful citizen (*militiae quamquam piger et malus, utilis urbi, Epist., II, 1, 124*). Moreover the poet puts the position which he once held in the army on the same level with the friendship of Maecenas (*Nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum, / quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum, / nunc, quia sim tibi, Maecenas convictor, at olim, / quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno, Sat., I, 6, 45-48*). No wonder! Horace had been tribune, and, since this title was not rightly his by law, the winning of it was the greater honor, especially in a time when there was no dearth of soldiers of good family to aspire to this rank.<sup>12</sup>

These facts certainly seem, at first glance, to be inconsistent with the supposition that Horace abandoned his shield. But the commentators think it a mistake to assume that it is dishonorable for a soldier to lose his shield, for, while the Greeks may have had this feeling, the honor of the Roman warrior is not touched, even if he throws his shield away.<sup>13</sup> Yet, as a matter of fact, in the Roman army it was at all times considered a heinous crime to give up one's arms; all authors who treat of the subject express this opinion. A soldier who lost his shield, whether by his own fault or not, lost his honor.<sup>14</sup> Horace, then, mentions a

<sup>12</sup> "Er [Horace] . . . wird hier, wo es an Offiziersaspiranten wahrlich nicht fehlt, Kommandant einer Legion—er ist offenbar schon eine hervortretende Persönlichkeit" (Richard Reitzenstein, *Das Römische in Cicero und Horaz, Neue Wege zur Antike*, II, p. 23). Even if, however, "Brutus was so hard pressed for officers that he was ready to make some concessions to the freedmen stock" (L. R. Taylor, *A. J. P.*, XLVI [1925], p. 165) he would not have commissioned Horace had he not been a good soldier. My attention was drawn to the article in *A. J. P.* by Prof. H. T. Rowell.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Heinze *ad v. 10* and C. L. Smith, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace* (1903), *ad loc.*: "The Greek ideal of 'returning with one's shield or on it' was foreign to the more business-like Roman."

<sup>14</sup> Cf. e. g. Polybius, VI, 37, 10: *eis δ' ἀναδρίαν τιθέσαι καὶ στρατιωτικὴν αἰσχύνην τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἔαν . . . παραπλησίως ἔαν τις ἀπορρίψῃ τι τῶν ὅπλων κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν κίνδυνον διὰ φόβου.* Plutarch, *Caesar*, 16, 3: *ἐν δὲ Βρεττανίᾳ . . . στρατιώτης . . . πολλὰ καὶ περίοπτα τόλμης ἀποδειξάμενος ἔργα . . . ἔρριψεν ἔαυτὸν *eis* ρεύματα τελματώδη, καὶ μόλις ἄνευ τοῦ θυρεοῦ . . . διεπέρασε.* Θαυμαζόντων δὲ τῶν περὶ τὸν Καίσαρα καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς καὶ κραυγῆς ἀπαντώντων, αὐτὸς εὖ μάλα κατηφής καὶ δεδακρυμένος προσέπεσε τῷ Καίσαρι, συγγράμμην αἰτούμενος ἐπὶ τῷ προέσθαι τὸν θυρέον; cf. Dionysius, *Antiquitates*, IX, 53, 4.

deed which, in the opinion of his contemporaries, must have seemed disgraceful. Moreover can it be supposed that he would recount his ignominy in such a nonchalant manner? He may relate without any hesitation that he was full of fear when the god came to his rescue (*Odes*, II, 7, 13-14). Even Aeneas, even the Homeric heroes are fearful when life is endangered, and Horace being saved like these heroes is not ashamed of feeling as they do in the same circumstances.<sup>15</sup> But the abandonment of the shield is dishonorable. If Horace was really capable of acting in such a way, he could no longer claim, as in fact he did, that he was a good soldier.

It is tempting to evade this conclusion by saying: "The kind of folk that have no horror of a joke will decline to discuss Horace's courage in this connection—Horace is 'reconstructed' and can afford to laugh at the 'terrible whipping we got'."<sup>16</sup> Even people who like jokes must admit that a jest about such a matter and at this place is not in keeping with the character of the poem as a whole and with the attitude of Horace as indicated by his other remarks. They, too, must feel the necessity of explaining how a man who threw away his shield at Philippi had before that day been so far from showing himself capable of such an act that his military virtues had won for him signal and extraordinary promotion. They, too, must consider that Horace, desiring as he did to be both in war and in peace a good Roman in the estimation of his contemporaries, could ill afford to play the coward and jest about it. They, too, must realize that it was certainly daring of him to show such indifference and yet to ask for the admiration of posterity on the ground that his virtues in war and in peace had proved his merit.

All the proposed interpretations then, whether they take Horace's words as a literary commonplace or a statement of fact, lead into difficulties. Horace cannot have feigned to have abandoned his shield ignominiously nor can he really have done so. But what else could he possibly mean to say?

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Virgil, *Aeneid*, I, 92 and Heyne's commentary on this passage (*Virgilii Opera*, ed. Ch. G. Heyne, II [1771], p. 17): "Naturae veritatem secutus poëta, exemplo Homeri Od. V, unde locus expressus, v. 297 . . . (cf. Achillis exemplum, qui mortem a Xanthi eluvie instantem similiter exhorrescit Il., XXI, 272) Aeneam suum metu vacare non sinit . . . Priscis heroibus nec metuere nec flere indecorum est."

<sup>16</sup> Horace, *Odes and Epodes*, ed. P. Shorey and Gordon J. Laing (1919), *ad loc.*

At this point it is necessary to draw attention to a problem which has hitherto not received adequate consideration: I refer to the division of the sentence in question. It is always taken for granted that *relicta non bene parmula* is to be connected with the previous words and refers to Horace. Yet this is not self-evident. It is also possible to connect *relicta non bene parmula* with what follows. Instead of punctuating:

tecum Philippos et celerem fugam  
sensi relicta non bene parmula,  
cum fracta virtus et minaces  
turpe solum tetigere mento,

one can also divide the words in this way:

tecum Philippos et celerem fugam  
sensi, relicta non bene parmula  
cum fracta virtus et minaces  
turpe solum tetigere mento.<sup>17</sup>

The technique of metrical structure allows the placing of a sense pause at this point in the verse (cf. *quis devium scortum elicit domo / Lyden?* *Odes*, II, 11, 21-22). The position of the ablative absolute before the temporal clause to which it belongs causes no difficulties (*nam, male re gesta, cum vellem mittere operto/ me capite in flumen, dexter stetit . . . , Sat.*, II, 3, 37-8; . . . *Hel-lade percussa Marius cum praecipitat se . . . , loc. cit.*, 277; cf. also *Carm. Saec.*, 9-10; *Odes*, I, 7, 21-22).<sup>18</sup> This other possible division being accepted the meaning of the words would be: "With you I have experienced the battle at Philippi and the quick flight, when virtue collapsed as the shield was ignominiously forsaken and the threatening hosts ignobly fell prostrate."<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> In regard to the usual punctuation cf. e.g. *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina*, ed. F. Klingner (1939) and Heinze, *op. cit.*; the seventh edition of Heinze's commentary (1930) omits the comma after *parmula*, no doubt by mistake as is evident from the interpretation given.

<sup>18</sup> The commentators have even taken pains to explain the position of the ablative absolute after the word in the interpretation that connects *relicta non bene parmula* with *sensi*; cf. H. D. Naylor, *Horace Odes and Epodes* (Cambridge, 1922), *ad loc.*

<sup>19</sup> For *relinquere* in the sense of *forsake* cf., e.g., *Od.* III, 27, 34 and the expression *signa relinquere*. The phrase *solum tetigere mento* is very often translated by "bit the dust." I cannot agree with such a rendering. The word *turpe* has no sense if it is used in regard to the death of the soldiers. Heinze (*ad loc.*) is certainly right in stating that

The words *relicta non bene parmula* then would not refer to Horace at all but rather to the soldiers of Brutus.

Is this the way in which Horace intended the phrase to be taken? That conclusion would follow only on two conditions: the various difficulties encountered by the other interpretations must be resolved by the rendering just proposed and it must in itself be unobjectionable; moreover it must fit the historical data. As to the first stipulation, it is obvious that the words, being no longer a description of Horace's attitude, cease to be contradictory to other statements of his in regard to his military career. In order to understand them it is not necessary to take refuge in literary topics or in questionable jokes. Furthermore, the new interpretation accounts for the use of the term *parmula* in this passage. The word cannot be correctly employed in connection with Horace himself, who, being a tribune, had no *parmula*; it is an antiquated, yet appropriate word for the shield of the soldiers.<sup>20</sup> Finally, the construction of the whole sentence now shows a perfect parallelism. In both parts of the *cum* clause the soldiers are the subject spoken of.<sup>21</sup> The phrase *minaces tetigere mento* is qualified by *turpe*; the expression *fracta virtus*, according to the usual arrangement without any explanatory attribute,

even for the vanquished death is not ignominious; the parallels quoted from the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* fail to prove the opposite as Heinze also points out. Concerning the historical facts described in these words, cf. pp. 449 f. *infra*.

<sup>20</sup> Festus, *De verborum significatu*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (1933), p. 274, 21 ff.: *Parmulis pugnare milites soliti sunt; quarum usum sustulit C. Marius datus in vicem earum Bruttianis.* Concerning Horace's shield cf. A. Ruppersberg, *Philologus*, LXVIII (1909), p. 523, and Heinze *ad loc.* In regard to archaic words cf. *quiritem* (v. 3) and Heinze *ad Od.* IV, 4, 40. The explanation that "There is the same irony in the diminutive *parmula* 'my poor little shield'" (*Horatii Opera*, ed. E. C. Wickham [1881], and Heinze *ad loc.*: "... wohl eine Nuance des Bedauerns . . .") is hardly convincing.

<sup>21</sup> Some commentators assume that virtue is to replace the name of Brutus (cf. e.g. Heinze *ad loc.*). Although Horace did not disavow his service in the army of Brutus, he can hardly refer to Brutus in such a way. For his expression would imply that with the death of Brutus virtue itself collapsed and that it no longer existed after Philippi. Moreover, Horace himself identifies the reign of Augustus with the reign of virtue, saying that virtue has come back under his government (*Carm. Saec.*, 58). Therefore I cannot agree with Castiglioni, *loc. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

is now qualified by *relicta non bene parmula*, the words *non bene* exactly corresponding to *turpe*.<sup>22</sup> The claim that virtue collapsed with the ignominious abandonment of the arms is as antithetical in itself as is the statement that threatening hosts ignobly fell prostrate. The first condition then is clearly fulfilled by the proposed rendering.

But did the soldiers forsake their shields ignominiously, and did they prostrate themselves ignobly before the enemy? Did their conduct deserve contemptuous irony because they were virtuous and haughty before? According to the historical sources,<sup>23</sup> the troops of Brutus with whom Horace fought were victorious in the first part of the battle of Philippi. After the defeat of the troops of Cassius they constrained Brutus, against his will, to reopen the fight, for they still boasted of themselves and their superiority over the enemy. Again they behaved courageously in the combat and repulsed the attacks of the regiments of Augustus. It was only after a long and very hard struggle that they began to retreat and that they were partly put to rout. At first those who still stayed with Brutus were ashamed and repented of their impetuosity. When, however, Brutus wanted them to fight again and to unite with the rest of the troops still in the camp, they declined to do so, telling him to mind his own business as they would try for themselves to make the best of a bad situation. Moreover, after hearing that Brutus had taken his life, they and all the others gave themselves over to the enemy.<sup>24</sup> In short, the soldiers, although they had been good and courageous fighters before, suddenly forsook their arms when they could still have fought. This was ignominious; thus virtue collapsed. Although threatening before, they wanted to fight only as long as they believed that they could win. In the moment of apparent defeat they thought only of surrender. They prostrated themselves ignobly before Augustus. Their conduct was contemptible.

Horace's indictment then, intended to emphasize the difference

<sup>22</sup> On the meaning of *bene* and *turpe* cf. Livy, XXII, 50, 7: . . . *qui se bene mori quam turpiter vivere maluit* . . . ; cf. also Livy, XXI, 42, 4 and the commentaries *ad loc.*

<sup>23</sup> Appian, *Hist. Rom.*, IV, 128-135; Dio Cassius, XLVII, 42 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. especially Appian, IV, 128: οὐ γὰρ ἐπίμεμπτοι γε ἡσαν οὐδὲ οἱ Βρούτειοι; 131: ἀπεκρίναντο ἀναξίως.

between what the soldiers pretended to be in words and what they showed themselves to be in deeds, is both adequate and true. To give the most emphatic expression to his ironic contempt the poet refers to the moment when the troops of Brutus surrendered. In what form the surrender took place has not been recorded by the historians, but it can be inferred from the usual form of a *deditio* (*παραδίδονται ἑαυτούς*, Appian, IV, 135). In such a situation the soldiers themselves or their legates came to the commander of the enemy troops, threw away their arms, and kneeled down or prostrated themselves, imploring the mercy of the victor. So the soldiers of Pompey behaved when vanquished by Caesar, so too did the barbarians conquered by the Roman emperor.<sup>25</sup> The case must have been similar when the soldiers of Brutus gave themselves up to Augustus whether they accepted the amnesty offered (Dio Cassius, XLVII, 49) or asked for it (Appian, IV, 135). The poet mentions the abandonment only of the shield, not of all the arms, apparently using the shield, the most valued weapon, as a symbol of all the others. The artist of the Trajan Column did the same: whereas the historian, describing the surrender of the Dacians, tells about the throwing away of all the arms, the sculptor merely shows the putting aside of the shield.<sup>26</sup> On the other hand, Horace was able to keep the motif of prostration which the artist, although it is recorded by the historian, could not portray and had to replace by the kneeling down of the legates.

To conclude: in the few words in question it is probable that Horace does not speak of himself but rather describes in accurate and proper terms the inglorious conduct of Brutus' troops at Philippi. No judgment of Horace's behavior or character can be based on these lines, except that even after so many years he still remembered with hurt pride the cowardice of his fellow

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Caesar, *B. C.*, III, 98: *Caesar prima luce omnes eos, qui in monte consederant, ex superioribus locis in planitiem descendere atque arma proicere iussit. Quod ubi sine recusatione fecerunt passisque palmis projecti ad terram flentes ab eo salutem petiverunt.* . . . Dio Cassius, LXVIII, 9, 1: *ὅτι δὲ Δεκέβαλος ἐπεπόμφει μὲν καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἡττης πρέσβεις . . . καὶ ἔκεινοι τά τε ὅπλα ρίψαντες καὶ ἑαυτούς ἐς τὴν γῆν καταβαλόντες ἐδεήθησαν τοῦ Τραϊανοῦ; ibid., 6-7: καὶ ἄκων ὠμολόγησε, πρός τε τὸν Τραϊανὸν ἐλθὼν καὶ ἐς τὴν γῆν πεσών καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἀπορρίψας (cf. ibid., 10, 1).*

<sup>26</sup> Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Trajanssäule* (Berlin, 1926), Text, IV (Gesandte und Gefangene), pp. 50-63, especially pp. 56 f.

soldiers of old. He himself had not surrendered but was among the officers who saved themselves by flight.<sup>27</sup> If Horace in writing the poem thought at all of the great Greek poets who like him had fought in war, he may have taken pleasure in realizing that in this one respect at least the Roman was superior to the Hellene.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

### FOUR LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

#### *ἀποπαιδαριώ<sup>1</sup>*

In *P. S. I.*, IV, 418, Pyron, who is known from other papyri as a scribe and agent connected with the estate of Apollonius,<sup>2</sup> writes to Zeno and makes certain requests, which, he says, Zeno had previously agreed to grant. First, he asks Zeno to provide "the boy" (*παιδάριον*) with a himation and send him to the palaestra; thus the boy seems to be one of those whom Apollonius was in the habit of training as professional athletes.<sup>3</sup> Whether Pyron's interest in the request arises from the fact that the boy is in his company or under his protection, or from his having previously recommended him as suited for an athletic training, does not appear. Nothing bearing upon the point can be inferred from his use of the first person plural in the following sentences. We see (18-22) that he asks for a garment, not garments, which looks as if his "we" means "I" throughout. The second request is that Zeno send an allowance of grain, oil, and other necessities, *ἴνα πανσώμεθα ἀσχημονοῦντες*; we may note in passing

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Dio Cassius, XLVII, 49: *τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ μὲν πλῆθος τῶν στρατιωτῶν αὐτίκα ἀδειαὶ σφίσι κηρυχθείστης μετέστη . . . τῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρώτων τῶν ἀρχάς τινας σχόντων . . . οἱ μὲν πλείους ἔαντοὺς παραχρῆμα ἀπέκτειναν . . . οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τότε ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν διέφυγον; cf. *tecum . . . celerem fugam/sensi, relicta non bene parmula/cum fracta virtus et minaces/turpe solum tetigere mento.**

<sup>1</sup> In this paper I refer to the new edition of Liddell and Scott, edited by H. S. Jones, as LSJ.

<sup>2</sup> *P. S. I.*, VI, 571; *P. Cairo Zen.*, 59253; *P. Mich. Zen.*, 46.

<sup>3</sup> Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt* (*University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History*, VI), pp. 172-4; Edgar in *P. Mich. Zen.*, Introd., p. 14.

that Pyron shows a naïve concern about proper appearances in other letters, as well as here.<sup>4</sup>

In the third item Pyron asks for clothing for himself, a *τριβάνιον*, or, if that is too expensive, linen cloth to make a himation (18-22). He introduces this request with a sentence (14-18) which the Italian editors say they do not understand. Yet they have given a good explanation of part of it; the aim of this note is to clear up a doubtful point that remains. The sentence is as follows:

*καὶ εἴ σοι φαίνεται, ἀποσύνταξον μὴ ὥσπερ τὸν κυβερνᾶς ἐπιτηροῦντας  
ώς ἂν εἰσερχόμεθα ἀποπαιδαριοῦν γυμνοὺς ιστάντας ἡμᾶς.*

The editors suggest, rightly, that there is an allusion to the custom of requiring newcomers into a game of dice to strip so that they might not conceal loaded dice and covertly exchange them for those previously used. But they do not explain the word *ἀποπαιδαριοῦν*, which does not occur elsewhere, and they offer no translation of the obscure sentence. Schubart, however, gives this version.<sup>5</sup> “Und wenn du meinst, so verbiete, dass man uns wie die Würfelspieler argwöhnisch betrachte, wenn wir eintreten, uns nackt hinstelle und veralbere.” He adds, by way of comment on the letter, “Besonders peinlich ist es ihm (Pyron), zusammen mit seinem Schützling infolge seiner Armut und seiner schäbigen Kleidung schief angesehen zu werden wie ein Würfelspieler, den man zwingt, sich nackt hinzustellen, damit er keinen falschen Würfel verbergen könne.”

This translation seems to me to err in two points. In the first place, sensitive as Pyron is about his personal appearance, he could hardly have expected Zeno to forbid people to view him with suspicion on his entrance into company; what authority could reach so far? Secondly, I doubt whether *ἀποπαιδαριοῦν* is *veralbern*. The German word I take to mean much the same as our “make a fool of,” “mock,” “hoax,” and the Greek equivalent of that is usually *παιζω* compounded with *διά*, *ἐν*, or *κατά*.

Now *ἀποπαιδαριώ* is not defined in LSJ, but it should mean “make into, or treat as, a *παιδάριον*”; compare *ἀποθεώ*, *ἀποθηριώ*. The appropriateness of the word in this place probably comes from the simple fact that in Egyptian villages small boys run

<sup>4</sup> P. S. I., VI, 571, 12, 20; P. Mich. Zen., 46, 6-10.

<sup>5</sup> Ein Jahrtausend am Nil, p. 49.

naked during most of their childhood; thus we see that *γυμνὸς ιστάντας* develops and explains *ἀποπαιδαριοῦν*. It is true, however, that in the papyri *παιδάριον* often means a slave-boy, and *ἀποπαιδαριοῦν* in this context might mean, or imply, providing a person with the scant costume allowed to slaves. In any case, I think that the order that Pyron wishes Zeno to give to his stewards is contained, with the exaggeration characteristic of this rather fussy letter-writer, in the words *μὴ . . . ἀποπαιδαριοῦν γυμνὸς ιστάντας ἵμᾶς*, while *ωσπερ . . . εἰσερχόμεθα* is all part of the comparison. I would therefore translate, “Give orders (to the stewards) that they are not to treat me as a small boy (or, slave boy), leaving me naked as do the dice-players, watching as we come in.”

The first person *εἰσερχόμεθα* merely adds, by imaginary participation, to the vividness of the comparison; this clause might have been, for example, *ὡς ἀν οἱ συγκυβεύοντες εἰσέρχονται*. As to *ὡς ἀν* the references given by the editors may be supplemented by Mayser, *Gram. der. griech. Pap.*, II, 1, pp. 270-271; II, 3, p. 79. Two possible objections to the translation proposed can, I think, be met. In the first place, *τοὺς κυβεύτας*, for which a nominative might have been expected, is attracted to the construction of *ιστάντας*; cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar for Colleges*, § 2465. Secondly, with the version that I have suggested, *τούς* might seem to be required before *ἐπιτηροῦντας* in order to make a neat construction. But anarthrous attributive participles are known in biblical Greek, as in Matt. 12, 25, *πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' έαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται*; and as Robertson has shown (*Gram. Greek N. T.*<sup>4</sup>, p. 1105), “It is not easy to draw the line between the anarthrous attributive participle and the predicate participle of additional statement.” I incline to treat *ἐπιτηροῦντας* as circumstantial, adding a descriptive detail.

### καθαπτάī

In *P. S. I.*, IV, 420, 21 ff., Semtheus reports to Zeno that a third person has on hand a stock of 300 vessels of earthenware, *γάστρας καὶ καθαπτάς*. *γάστραι* are undoubtedly big-bellied pots, and that meaning is adequately attested in LSJ. On *καθαπτάī* the note of the Italian editor is merely “quid? ‘vasi ansati?’” LSJ is content with the definition “a kind of vase,” and is uncertain whether the *καθαπτάς* of *P. S. I.* is from *καθαπτής*, -οῦ, or *καθαπτή*.

The meaning may be settled by joining an archaeological observation to a consideration of the natural meaning of *καθάπται*. The word is surely merely the feminine plural of the verbal *καθαπτός* from *καθάπτω*. This verb is not often found in our texts in its literal and material sense, which is, to hang or sling one thing to or round another. Plutarch uses it in speaking of garlands about the neck (*Quaest. Conv.*, 3, 1, 647 E), Euripides of objects hung round a child's neck (*Ion* 1006), Sophocles of a garment thrown round the shoulders (*Tr.* 1051), of a fawn-skin slung across the body (*Ichn.* 219, with Pearson's note), and of Antigone's hanging herself from the roof of her prison (1222). The word would naturally describe vessels carried in a kind of sling made of cordage and may be rendered sling-bottles or sling-jars. Now such vessels are known to have been very commonly used in Graeco-Roman Egypt. In the excavation conducted by the University of Michigan at Karanis several specimens, both large and small, were unearthed, most of them in an excellent state of preservation and several with the carrying-sling still attached to them. Some quite small ones were probably oil-flasks and may have been slung from a belt. In these the sling is simply looped through the handle of the vessel or the cord is first drawn tightly round the neck of the vessel two or three times and then passed through the handle.

With the larger vessels the arrangement varies. There is one medium-sized jar without handles, which has the cord passed three times round the neck, just below the lip, and then tied in such a manner that a loop large enough to serve as a lifting-handle is left on each side; a sling cord could, of course, be passed through these handles. Others of moderate size have a cord slung through the handle, or handles, as in the case of the smallest. With some large and heavy vessels a more elaborate sling was used. Supposing the rope used to be laid out in the form of a narrow ellipse, with the ends still loose, a small segment of the closed end of the ellipse is fitted to the neck of the vessel so as to clasp half of it. Then next to this measured segment, on each side, a carefully tied loop or eye is made. The two eyes thus formed are pushed through the two handles of the jar, and while they are held in this position a strong stick is passed horizontally through the two eyes, so that they can no longer be drawn back through the handles. Then the loose ends of the

rope are tied, or as in our specimen, spliced together, so as to serve as a carrying sling. Vessels thus equipped could be carried on a shoulder pole; but they were often slung from the saddles of camels. For this purpose a wooden hook was sometimes used, the upper end of the hook being provided with a loop of rope to attach it to a projection of the saddle. Sometimes several vessels were carried on a kind of rack slung from the saddle and consisting of a stout bar provided with several pegs or knobs projecting upward from it, to each of which the sling of a jar could be attached. The cordage used in all these sling-devices is made of palm-fiber.

The subject deserves a minute description accompanied by illustrations; and I hope that the topic will be treated, in a manner more likely to meet the approval of archaeologists, by a member of the staff of our museum. The objects that I have described can be dated by the levels at which they were found and range from the first to the fifth century of our era.

It may be worth while to add that pots intended to be carried by a sling are usually not provided with a base broad enough to support them in an upright position, and some are pointed, or at least quite narrow at the bottom. Their more slender outlines would be in striking contrast to those of the γάστραι, and thus we can understand why the writer of the papyrus letter roughly divides the pots into these two groups.

### ἀσσάλιος

The word *ἀσσάλιος*, which is not to be found in any lexicon, occurs in a little-known apocryphal text, the Testament of Job (ch. 7). The work has been twice edited, by Mai (*Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, VII, pp. 180 ff.) from a Vatican manuscript, and by M. R. James (*Texts and Studies*, V, 1) from a Paris manuscript; there are numerous verbal differences between the two texts. The work is dated by James in the second or third century. The passage where our word occurs begins the story of a visit of Satan to Job's house and stands as follows in James' edition :

οὐδὲ Σατανᾶς ἀκούσας ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἐπέθετο τοῖς ὄμοις ἀσσάλιον, καὶ ἐλθὼν λελάληκεν τῷ θυρωρῷ λέγων· εἰπόν τῷ Ἰώβ, Δός μοι ἄρτον ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἵνα φάγω.

While Mai's text is quite different, the only variant that concerns us is the addition of *ρακκώδη*, "ragged," after *ἀσσάλιον*; it shows that the editor of that recension took *ἀσσάλιον* to be masculine, not neuter. It is clear from the context that an *ἀσσάλιος* was something appropriate to the disguise of a beggar. Gustave Brunet, who has made from Mai's text the only complete translation of the Testament,<sup>6</sup> renders *ἀσσάλιον ρακκώδη* "un vêtement en lambeaux." James did not translate his text, but, in a paraphrase of the story which he published for young readers,<sup>7</sup> the phrase "put a wallet on his shoulder" shows how he interpreted *ἀσσάλιον*. The adjective *ρακκώδη* in Mai's text perhaps suits a garment a little better, but its presence is certainly not decisive.

The word *ἀσσάλιος* is probably an adjective derived from the Latin *axilla*, through a popular form *assella*, which, along with *ascilla* and *ascella*, is attested in later Latin and may have belonged to the vulgar speech from an early period. All three of these popular forms are found as manuscript variants on a single passage of Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, 4, 60 *ad fin.*, ed. Harvey), where he is quoting Matt. 23, 37-38.<sup>8</sup> The *e* in the second syllable of the Latin word has been assimilated to the *a* of the first, probably after its adoption by Greeks; cf. Mayser, *Gram.*, I, pp. 59 f.

If, as I think, *ἀσσάλιος* is an adjective, *χιτών* was probably originally expressed, then understood, with it. In this respect the word resembles the genuine Greek *ἀμφιμάσχαλος* (*χιτών*) of Aristophanes, *Eq.* 882. This analogy favors "shirt" rather than "wallet," though it is true that a wallet was slung over a shoulder and might hang under an arm.

There is a difficulty in this explanation, which must not be overlooked. In view of the long duration (until the sixth century) of the hard *c* before *e* and *i*,<sup>9</sup> it is clear that in order to provide a loanword for the Testament of Job, *assella* must have been derived not from *ascella* but directly from *axilla*. The change *x > ss* is not an obstacle in itself, since we know that

<sup>6</sup> In Migne, *Dict. des apocryphes*, II, 404 (*Encycl. Théol.*, XXIV).

<sup>7</sup> *Old Testament Legends* (1913), pp. 85-86.

<sup>8</sup> According to the *Thesaurus*, s. v. *axilla*, *assela*, not *assella*, is the spelling in the two Irenaeus MSS that begin the word with *ass-*.

<sup>9</sup> See Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 87-88.

*cossim* was used for *coxim* by the farce-writer L. Pomponius (*fl. 89 B. C.*).<sup>10</sup> But the form *axilla*, according to the *Thesaurus*, is found only as a name and in certain glosses. Consequently the explanation of *ἀσσάλιος* suggested above depends upon the assumption that *axilla*, despite its being so scantily attested, was current long enough to give rise to a popular pronunciation *assella* at some time before the second century A. D.

### *πρόφασις* in late Greek

Several years ago, in a paper called "Demons of the Bath,"<sup>11</sup> I called attention to a peculiar use of the word *πρόφασις* occurring in the apocryphal Acts of John attributed to Prochorus, and indicated my intention to take the subject up for fuller discussion at some later time. Meanwhile, the few related examples that I had collected have been increased by several interesting passages contributed by letter by Dr. Darwell Stone, the editor of the projected lexicon of patristic Greek; to him, as also to Dr. W. E. Crum and Dr. H. I. Bell, who have made valuable suggestions, I would record my obligations.

The semantic development of the word, as traced in LSJ, is as follows: first, *alleged motive* or *plea*, whether true or false (when false, translated "pretext," "pretense," "excuse"); second, *actual motive*, *purpose*, or *cause*, and as a development from these meanings, *occasion*. Some of the unfamiliar uses of *πρόφασις* may be viewed as extensions of the idea of *occasion*. There are examples of this use in English, such as "their lawful occasions" (Book of Common Prayer), where it means "affairs" or "business," and the colloquial "This is a pleasant occasion," said of a social entertainment or "affair." For this aspect of the word *πρόφασις*, we may note the following examples.

Theod. Mopsuest., *In evang. Ioan. comm. prooem.* (P. G., LXVI, 728B): ἡ μὲν γὰρ Σίμωνος πρόφασις τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον τὴν ἐπὶ Ρώμην ὁδὸν ποιήσασθαι παρεσκεύαζεν, ἔτερον δὲ ἐτέρως. Translate "the affair," "the matter" of Simon.

*Acta Joannis*, ed. Th. Zahn, p. 24: after telling how, at the building of a certain bath-house, a youth or a maiden had been buried in the foundations, the writer continues ἐν τούτῳ οὖν τῷ

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>11</sup> In *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith* (1932), p. 204.

**βαλανείω ἡ τοιαύτη πρόφασις ἐγένετο.** Translate “affair,” “incident.”

*P. Cairo Masp.*, III, 67306, 11 (sixth century), a cancellation of an acknowledgment of debt: εἰ συμβαίη ἐνάγειν σοι οἶον [δήποτε ἀν]θρωπον, περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς προφάσεως τῆς ὑποθήκης, ἐτοί[μως ἔχω] ποιῆσαι τὸ ἀνενόχλητόν σοι. Translate, “matter,” “business.”

In a list of payments, *P. Cairo Masp.*, I, 67058, iii, 20 (sixth century)? Here, as in the next two examples, I give the expanded text, which is much abbreviated in the originals): Ψοίω νομεραρίω προφάσει Σερηνοῦ, where προφάσει is “in the matter of” or perhaps “for the account of” (so also probably *P. Oxy.*, 1717, 1).

*P. Lond.*, IV, 1434, 57 (714-6 A. D.): ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ συμβούλου ὑπὲρ προφάσεως δρομικῶν ἀλόγων ἀλλαγῆς; “on the subject of,” “concerning.” Similarly 1441, 67 (706 A. D.), μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐκ προφάσεως ναυτῶν, κτλ.

This development, “subject,” or “topic,” suggests that “heading” or “caption” would suit better than “general view” (Sophocles’ definition) or “preface” (LSJ) in Dioscurides, περὶ ιοβόλων, 3 (Kühn, *Medici Graeci*, XXVI, 2, p. 66), πρῶτον μὲν τὰς σημειώσεις αὐτῶν ὑπὸ μίαν ἐκθησόμεθα πρόφασιν.

In the ninth Clementine homily, ch. 10 (*P. G.* II, 249A), warning against fleshly temptations, the writer says διὰ τούτο χρὴ προσφεύγειν θεῷ εὐχαῖς καὶ δεήσεσιν, ἀπεχομένους πάσης ἀκαθάρτου προφάσεως. “Occasion” or “purpose” might serve here, but one suspects that the word πρόφασις has been weakened in loose usage to a point where it means little more than “thing.” One way in which this weakening of the meaning is furthered may be illustrated by the next two passages, in each of which πρόφασις, being placed in close connection with other words meaning “occasion” or “reason,” tends to lose its own definiteness of content. So in Libanius, *Decl.*, 26, 22 (*On the garrulous wife*), πᾶσα γὰρ πρόφασις λόγων ἀφορμή, ἀν οἴκοι μένω, ἀν εἰς ἀγορὰν ἀπέλθω, κτλ. Here one may indeed translate “every occasion is a starting-point for talk,” but the virtually synonymous character of πρόφασις and ἀφορμή tends to reduce the former to “subject” or merely “thing.” Similarly in Methodius, *De Libero Arbitrio*, 15, 3 (p. 184, 4 ff. of Bonwetsch’s Berlin edition), after mentioning circumstances in which homicide is justifiable, ἐὰν δέ τις τὸν μηδέν τι τῶν ἀπηγορευμένων πεποιηκότα ἀναιρήσῃ οὐδενὸς ἀλλης προφάσεως λόγου χάριν, ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν οἰκείων ἀφαιρέσεως ἔνεκα,

*τουτέστιν ἡ χρημάτων ἡ κτημάτων, φαῦλον ἐργάζεται.* Here, it is true, corruption has been suspected; but the attempts to correct it were doubtless prompted by uncertainty as to the use of *πρόφασις*.

The notion of *occasion* passes into that of *means, way*, in several instances, as follows:

Ps.-Clem., *Hom.*, 3, 11 (*P. G.*, II, 117 C): *περὶ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ* (i. e. a prophet) *μὴ ἀπλῶς διαλαμβάνειν* (decide), *ἀλλ’ εἰ δύναται ἄνει ἔτέρας προφάσεως συνεστάναι αὐτοῦ* *ἡ πρόγνωσις*.

*Idem, Hom.*, 7, 2 (*P. G.*, II, 200 B), *θεῷ τῷ κτίσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸ σύμπαν οὐ λείπει πρόφασις πρὸς σωτηρίαν τῶν σώζεσθαι θελόντων.*

*Idem, Epist. ad Jacobum*, 9 (*P. G.*, II, 44 B), *πρὸς δὲ τὴν αὐτῆς (i. e. ἀγαπῆς) εἰσόδον μία τίς ἐστιν ἵκανὴ πρόφασις, ἡ κοινὴ τῶν ἀλών μετάληψις.*

*Ibid.*, 8 *ad fin.*, ἐννούμενοι τὰς προφάσεις τῆς ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς, *τεχνίτη ἔργον, ἀδρανεῖ ἔλεος.*

*Acta Xanthippae et Polyxenae* (ed. James, *Texts and Studies*, II, 3), 8 (p. 62, 32), *ἴσως γένη μοι πρόφασις σωτηρίας.*

*Ibid.*, 41 (p. 85, 24), *ὅρᾶς δὲ πώς δὰ πολλῶν προφάσεων σώζει πολλοὺς ὁ θεός.* But in 18 (p. 71, 10) *καὶ τοῖς δυσπιστοῖς δὰ προφάσεως ἔξιλεοῦται ὁ θεός*, *δὰ προφάσεως* is probably “for a purpose.”

*πρόφασις* is clearly “way,” “manner” in a passage in Mark the Deacon’s *Life of Porphyrius*, 3: *αἰτούμενος δὲ αὐτῶν* (i. e. *εὐχῶν*) *τὴν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ χάριν τε καὶ βοήθειαν εἰς τὸ δυνηθῆναι, οἵᾳ δίπτοτε προφάσει, τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ ἀγιοῦ ἀνδρὸς διηγήσασθαι.* Grégoire and Kugener in their edition translate *πρόφασις* “manière,” and cite as a parallel a Christian inscription (fifth century) from Delos,<sup>12</sup> *ἢ τις* (perhaps to be read *εἴ τις*) *ἔστιν πρόφασις ἀμαρτιῶν, ταύτην ἐποίησα.* Here *πρόφασις* is almost our “kind,” “sort.”

CAMPBELL BONNER.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

<sup>12</sup> H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscr. gr. chrét. d’Asie Mineure*, no. 214.

## NOTES ON MENANDER.

*The double herm of Homer-Menander.* One portrait of a double herm, found near the Appian way and now in the Terme Museum in Rome,<sup>1</sup> was at once recognized as that identified by Studniczka<sup>2</sup> as Menander. The resemblance to the comic poet of the Lateran relief, for an illustration of which see page 131 of the Loeb Menander, is particularly convincing evidence. Menander's squint, attested by Suidas, is also clearly portrayed in the copy belonging to the University of Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia, so much so that casual observers notice it without any prompting. The other portrait of the double herm was proved by J. F. Crome<sup>3</sup> to represent Homer, not Aristophanes, as had been supposed. Crome argued, however, that Homer was coupled, not with Menander, but with Vergil. Poulsen in a review<sup>4</sup> of Crome's work confidently asserts on stylistic grounds that the Menander portrait belongs to the third century B. C. and hence cannot represent Vergil. Körte has demolished the argument that Homer and Menander would not be coupled by quoting an epigram preserved on a bust at Turin.<sup>5</sup> The writer of the epigram places Menander opposite Homer in his gallery because Aristophanes of Byzantium rated him next to Homer as a poet. There is another reason why the sculptor might couple Homer and Menander, for they were the two writers first read by boys in the elementary schools of Rome. Hence we may assume that the classroom, if it contained portraits at all, would have Homer and Menander. There is ample evidence to show that Menander came after Homer in the elementary curriculum. In Statius, *Silvae*, II, 1, 113-9 we read that the talent of a precocious boy was displayed in his recitations of Menander and Homer; and no other writer is mentioned. Compare Quintilian's

<sup>1</sup> Illustrated in Margarete Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* (Princeton, 1939), fig. 222. See also D. M. Robinson, "A New Marble Bust of Menander, Wrongly Called Vergil," *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, LXXXIII (1940), pp. 465-78.

<sup>2</sup> *Neue Jahrbücher*, XLI/XLII (1918), pp. 1-31.

<sup>3</sup> "Das Bildnis Vergils," *Atti e Memorie, Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova*, XXIV (1935), pp. 167 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Gnomon*, XII (1936), pp. 90-95.

<sup>5</sup> *I. G.*, XIV, 1183; see A. Körte, "Homer und Menander," *Hermes*, LXXI (1936), pp. 221 f.

(I, 11, 12; I, 8, 7) recommendation of comedy, particularly Menander, as practice for the young declaimer. So Ausonius, in a letter to his grandson (*Epistle* 22, 46 f.) exhorts him to study the same two poets. It would be more surprising if we did not find such a double herm.

*Epitrepontes*, 390-7. The difficulty in supplementing line 395 is such that Körte leaves a blank in his edition. The difficulty has arisen, I believe, because it was supposed that *ταύτην* in the preceding line must refer to Pamphila. But *ταύτης* in line 386 refers to Habrotonon, and it seems to me quite certain that Onesimus refers to her with the same pronoun a second time. This permits us to fill out the whole passage as follows:

νῦν ἐπισφαλῆ  
τὰ πράγματ' ἔστι τὰ περὶ τὴν κεκτημέ[νην].  
ταχέως ἐὰν γὰρ εὑρεθῇ πατρὸς κόρ[η]  
ἐλευθέρου μήτηρ τε τοῦ νῦν παιδί[ου]  
γεγονού', ἐκείνην λήψεται, ταύτην [ἀφείς.  
ἔπεινξ[εθ] ἡ γὰρ ἔ]νδον ἀπολείπειν. [ὅλως  
καὶ νῦν χαριέντως ἐκνενευκέναι δο[κῶ  
τῷ μὴ δί' ἐμοῦ ταυτὶ κυκᾶσθαι.

The only certain word in line 395 is *ἀπολείπειν*, the technical term used of a woman who leaves her husband as the first step in divorce. It may be used of a man who leaves his wife, but in that case means merely "leave" and implies neither a permanent separation nor divorce. Onesimus sees Charisius involved with three women: his wife; Habrotonon; and the mother of his child, who is probably a citizen. The recognition of Habrotonon will win her freedom and the position of *pallake*. Pamphila will be glad to obtain a divorce; in this Onesimus agrees with the mistaken calculation of Smicrines, who cannot imagine his daughter tolerating a rival. Since the real mother is rich and already bound to Charisius by the child, she and Charisius have everything to gain by marriage. What will become of Habrotonon? When she no longer poses as mother of the baby, Charisius will have no reason to keep her. In fact she would be an obstacle to his new marriage and must be dismissed.

The expression *ἀφείς* is inappropriate to Pamphila. Since Charisius could not legally keep her from going, Onesimus would

not speak of him as letting her go. I assume that Onesimus takes it for granted that Pamphila will take the initiative. He is wrong, to be sure, in thinking that she will seek a divorce, but right in supposing that Charisius will get rid of Habrotonon, when he finds the real mother of his child, for this action evidently takes place in our play before the final appearance of Smicrines in Act 5.

The word *ἔνδον* was read by Sudhaus and is much more likely than Jensen's *ναῦν*, which he himself once declared did not fit the visible traces (*Hermes*, XLIX [1914], p. 387). The shorter word *γάρ* seems more likely than *γοῦν* in spite of Sudhaus' discovery of traces that he read as *τήν*, which would perhaps fit *γοῦν*. The first word might be *ἐπείξεθ'* except for the fact, noted by Körte, that most students of the papyrus have read the fourth letter as Υ. In any case my reading is stronger, implying that Pamphila will offer vows of thanksgiving for the privilege of leaving her husband. I have not found the verb in this use as early as Menander, but *εὐχή* and *εὐκτόν* are familiar expressions for "the best that one can ask or hope for." The same idea is present in *Samia*, 171: ἀγαπήσει καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς θύσει, "she will be content, in fact she will celebrate with sacrifices." I propose *ὅλως* at the end of the line, rather than *ὅμως*, because I see no point in the adversative here and prefer to take *καί* as the conjunction. There is a parallel in Antiphanes, frag. 33:

ὅλως  
αὐτὴν ὄρāν γὰρ τὴν Ἀκαδήμειαν δοκεῖ.

#### *Perikeiromene* 36-42.

ἢ δὲ τῷ προειδέ[ναι]  
ἀδελφὸν ὅντ' οὐκ ἔφυγε, προσιὼν δ'[ο] [ό]ξένος  
ὄρᾶ. τὰ λοιπὰ δ' αὐτὸς [*εἴρηχ*'], δὲν τρ[όπον]  
δ' μὲν ὥχετ' εἰπὼν ὅτι κατὰ σχολὴν ιδ[εῖν]  
αὐτὴν <έ>τι βούλεθ', [ἥ δ'] ἐδάκρυ' ἐστῶσα καὶ  
ώδύρεθ'—ὅτι ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐλευθέρως ποεῖν  
ἔξεστιν αὐτῇ.

It is usually assumed that it was Polemon who saw Moschion kissing Glycera. I assume that it was Sosia (171 ὁ ξένος) for Polemon "was at once beside himself" (410, εὖθὺς ἐπαρώνουν), and there are good reasons for supposing that the actual assault on Glycera's hair took place during the action, that is, on the

day of the play, not the night before. Polemon is known to the audience as *σφόδρος*, a word that seems to imply action as at *Epitrepontes*, 352: *κατέβαλες δέ μ' ὡς σφόδρα*. There are in the play no altercations between Polemon and Glycera. If there were, the effect would be more tragic than comic, or else sympathy would be lessened. The principals meet for a reconciliation in the last act; it would not be in the manner of Menander to show them together after the outrage. Agnoia fears that someone may have felt disgust (47), presumably when Glycera's hair was shorn, for the aorist is used as of a sudden emotion. The operation would take place off-stage and be reported to the audience by Doris or Sosia looking through the door. Even when Glycera appears later, her veil might easily hide her hair so that she would not be deprived of her charm for the audience. The best reason for thinking that the shearing was presented directly is that Agnoia refers to it as to a thing perfectly clear in the minds of the spectators without any direct statement. We are justified in assuming that anything explained by Agnoia has not been explained before and that anything not explained was presented in action.

There is furthermore no case of a present participle as title of a play where it is probable that the title does not, as in the *Epitrepontes*, refer to an incident within the frame of the play. The argument of Ulbrecht is completely unconvincing.<sup>6</sup> He considers it improbable that the heroines of *'Εμπιμπραμένη* or *'Ραπιζομένη* could have been set on fire or slapped on-stage. The question, however, is not whether the shearing happened on-stage or not, but whether it happened, probably off-stage, after the action of the play had begun. In the *Heracles Mainomenos* of Euripides the madness is off-stage, but it is part of the action. Again the burning or the slapping may have been merely threatened, under way but not completed, like the roasting of the babe off-stage in the *Samia* (209, *ἐμπρήσεων*) or the roasting of Davus at the altar in Menander's *Perinthia* (20, *κάετε*). The same method is threatened by Lycus in Euripides' *Heracles* (240-6) to force Heracles' wife and children from the altar. Presumably Menander's *Empimpramene* had a similar scene enacted on the stage. The beating of a woman could also

<sup>6</sup> *Kritische und exegetische Studien zu Menander* (Würzburg, Tritsch, 1933), pp. 41 f.

happen in Greek comedy off-stage or could be threatened, if we may judge Greek feeling about such incidents by what happens in romances. The hero of Chariton's romance actually kicks his wife in a fit of jealousy when she is pregnant. The heroine of Heliodorus' *Ethiopica* (VII, 7, 6), disguised as a beggar, is publicly slapped. Scenes in which torture is threatened also occur. Wives are not beaten, as a rule, in Greek fiction, but slave women are, and violence produced by jealousy was no more unforgivable than it is in Chinese novels, as the *Perikeiromene* itself clearly indicates. Menander was too good a showman not to make the ill treatment of Glycera as vivid as possible in order to arouse sympathy. To represent Glycera in an altercation on the stage would have spoiled the effect entirely. Furthermore Agnoia would surely have explained in her narrative that Polemon took action at once, if the audience were intended to suppose that he had done so.

Hence I conclude that the observer of Moschion's kiss was Sosia, who acts as spy for his master throughout the play. To whom do the pronouns in 38 f. refer? Coppola in his annotated edition<sup>7</sup> interprets both as referring to Moschion, while in the Loeb translation both seem to be taken as referring to Polemon. On my interpretation it must be Moschion who left Glycera with the remark that he would see her again at leisure; and the words fit, for Moschion had been interrupted by the appearance of a spectator, while Polemon would not have waited to demand an explanation. Again if he had sheared Glycera there and then, she would not have stood weeping and lamenting that she could not freely see Moschion; she would have had something worse to lament. In line 38 *αὐτός* might conceivably mean Moschion or Sosia; it makes little difference. We know that Sosia had appeared, since at line 52 it is assumed that he is known to the audience. In any case neither Moschion nor Sosia could have known why Glycera was lamenting. Hence I have put a dash before *ὅτι* in line 41 to show that what follows is an addition by Agnoia herself.

*Perikeiromene*, 114. Merely because a gayer rhythm better suits Moschion's character and mood, I should read:

*τὴν δ' Ἀδράστειαν μάλιστα νῦν ἄρ' [ἰκετεύω θε]ῳ[ν]*

The last letter may have been indicated by a line above the Ω.

<sup>7</sup> Torino, Chiantore, 1938.

*Perikeiromene, 135-7.*

κατακέχρη]σαί μοι. (Δα) γελοῖον. ή μὲν οὖν μήτηρ—  
 (Μο) τί φῆς;  
 οὐκ ἔραν η]κουσαν αὐτήν, η τί πρᾶγμ; οὐχ ἐνεκ' ἐμοῦ  
 εἴπας ω]ς πέπεικας ἐλθεῖν πρός μ';  
 (Δα) ἐγώ δ' εἰρηκά σοι κτλ.

In line 136 recent editors print *οὐ φυγεῖν ἐκοῦσαν αὐτήν*, which does not quite fit. Flight is in its nature voluntary, a choice of the lesser of two evils. We might better read *οὐ μένειν ἐκοῦσαν* or *οὐ παρεῖν' ἐκοῦσαν*, for Moschion is evidently disconcerted to hear that Glycera does not wish his company. He had supposed that her *coming* was proof of her love. But *οὐκ ἔραν ηκουσαν* is the most forcible expression of his deduction from her coming and his surprise to find himself mistaken. It is sound psychology to represent Moschion as ignoring everything but the precise point that matters to him. Since both Myrrhina and Glycera were clearly acting voluntarily, neither *ἐκοῦσαν* nor *ἀκοῦσαν* is particularly probable. The other possibilities with *ηκουσαν*, such as *οὐ φιλεῖν, ἀρ' ὀκνεῖν, μετανοεῖν* seem less likely than my suggestion.

*Perikeiromene, 158.* Davus urges Moschion to do something and enter the house in decent style. Sudhaus would have him change his costume (*μεταβαλοῦ τρόπον τινὰ*). Jensen would have him invest himself with some sort of behavior (*περιβαλοῦ τρόπον τινὰ*). According to Jensen, Sudhaus' reading does not fit the traces of letters in the papyrus. Certainly Jensen's reading does not fit an unphilosophical slave such as Davus. Another possibility is *παραβαλοῦ τρόπον τινὰ*. Compare Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.*, 711d: *φείδον καὶ παραβάλλον*. Since in another passage we find *ἐπίσχεις καὶ παραβαλοῦ τὸ θυρίον τοῦ λόγου*, *De facie*, 940 f (cf. 965 b), the metaphor seems to refer to the closing of the orifice of a water-clock when an oration ceased. In the *Frogs* of Aristophanes (180) *παραβαλοῦ* is Charon's order to the rowers to ship oars or bring the boat to land. The vague *τρόπον τινά*, "in a way," is used by Davus in the *Hero* (20) of Menander. Hence we may translate: "come to rest somehow and go inside in decent fashion," or "pull up, more or less, etc."

*Perikeiromene, 307-10.*

εἰλόμην δ' οὔτως ἐγ[ώ  
 ἀφρόνως ἔχειν ἔχθραν τε πρᾶ[ξαι τοῖς φίλοις

ἵμιν θ' ὑπόνοιαν καταλιπεῖν [ἢν ἐκβαλεῖν  
ἢν ἔξαλεῖψαι τ' οὐκέτ', οὐδ' αἰσχ[ύνομαι,  
Πάταικε;

The supplement in line 309 with the accents and division of words in the next line were credited to me by Allinson in the revision of his Loeb version (1930). The reading of Jensen and Körte is *καταλιπεῖν ἀκοσμίας* ḥν ἔξαλεῖψαιτ' κτλ. The potential optative without *ἄν* was a stumbling-block to Allinson as it is to me. Such usage cannot be proved possible by an occasional prose passage, where there may well be a scribal omission. Note the skepticism of a reviewer in *C. R.*, LIV (1940), p. 22 with regard to the attribution of such a use to Hyperides. The use of *ἐκβαλεῖν* in the sense "disown," "eliminate from the record," is illustrated by Sophocles, *O. T.*, 849:

κούκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ τοῦτό γ' ἐκβαλεῖν πάλιν.

The modal use of *ἢν* without *ἄν* in a statement that would be contrary to fact in English is normal Greek. The arrangement of words in *τ' οὐκέτ' οὐδ'* with the repetition of *τ' οὐ-* is appropriate to express Glycera's strong feeling. There are similar assonances in *καταλιπεῖν*, *ἢν ἐκβαλεῖν*, *ἢν ἔξαλεῖψαι*. Note also the assonance of initial and final letters in *ἔχειν* *ἔχθραν*, *ἵμιν θ' ὑπόνοιαν*. The whole effect is truly remarkable. Glycera is simply exploding with righteous indignation, and I like her the better for it. Menander's verse was written for the actor, not for the reader, as Demetrius notes (*De Elocutione*, 4, 193 f.). Strong feeling or action is indicated by the rhythm, as in *Epitrepones*, 706 f., where the jolts of the verse show that Smicrines is shaking the old woman: *προπετῶς ἀπάγω*, *περιμένω* *καταφαγεῖν*. The supplement that I reject is appropriate rather to a staid observer than to the excited Glycera. In line 308 I adopt *τοῖς φίλοις* as stronger in sense and rhythm than other supplements.

*Perikeiromene*, 344-348.

Ἐν τῶν] ἀδυνάτων ἔστι, τουτί μοι δοκεῖ  
σκοποῦν]τι, τὴν ἐμὴν τεκοῦσαν μητέρα  
μόνην προ]έσθαι θυγατέρ' αὐτῇ γενομένην·  
εἰ δὲ γεγένητ]αι τοῦτ', ἀδελφὴ δ' ἔστ' ἐμὴ  
αὐτῇ, κάκιστ'] ἔφθαρμ' ὁ δυστυχῆς ἔγώ.

In line 344 Körte reads, with Gomme's approval:<sup>3</sup> οὐ τῶν ἀδυνάτων, taking τὴν μητέρα as referring not to Myrrhina, but to Moschion's unknown natural mother. This interpretation requires the assumption that Moschion has learned from Myrrhina that he is a foundling. There are reasons for not accepting this. In line 363 Moschion still refers to Myrrhina as his mother, and the evidence that he is a foundling does not come until line 356. The reason that he is not stunned by this disclosure is that he suspected the truth, not that he knew it. No one of course will suppose that *τεκούσαν* in 345 is a defining attribute; its position forbids it to mean anything but "my mother, *having borne a daughter.*"

With my reading Moschion refuses to believe that Myrrhina would, after giving birth to a daughter, have exposed her. The gap in 346 contained an expression that would make the action still more unbelievable. Sudhaus' λάθρᾳ will not do, for the position is emphatic, and the secret disposal of a babe would surely be normal. The most likely possibilities are ταύτην, μόνην, πρώτην, and ζῶσαν. Daughters are, as Gomme points out, highly valued in Greek comedy, but people might value one daughter without wanting to have more. Moschion would know that Myrrhina had no daughter living, hence that it was an only daughter that was abandoned. To be sure, the missing word may be ζῶσαν. Chremes in Terence, *H.T.*, 626-43 is indignant because a newborn daughter of his had been exposed to be brought up as a prostitute or a slave, instead of being put out of existence as he had ordered. Moschion may have agreed with Chremes that it is a sin to expose a babe alive, though it is no sin to let it die and bury it. The women were expected to keep unwanted babies out of sight and out of mind. On the other hand, γενομένην is not likely to mean simply "born," for that would duplicate the sense of *τεκούσαν* in the preceding line. It is, therefore, best to read μόνην, which may be taken with γενομένην as equivalent to μονογενῆ.

What then did Moschion know? It is clear that he knew something that left him hesitant between two alternatives: 1. Was he himself a foundling and not Myrrhina's natural son? With line 356 he discovers that this is actually so. 2. Was he Myrrhina's son, though his sister was a foundling? This alter-

\* *Class. Quart.*, XXX (1936), pp. 68 f.; 193.

native he rejects in line 344 as an impossibility. He knew then that Glycera was his sister and that she was a foundling. In line 285 he declared himself the most miserable of men, probably because he had discovered that Glycera was his sister. It was not impossible, however, that Myrrhina had brought her up secretly like the heroine of Menander's *Phasma*. When he observed and overheard the scene of recognition in which Glycera displays the tokens, he sees of course that she was brought up as a foundling. This starts him thinking, and he concludes that he too must be a foundling, a conclusion that is soon confirmed by what he overhears. It is natural that he should not exclaim in surprise when he becomes aware of a fact that he has reached by deduction.

How did Moschion discover that Glycera was his sister without the opportunity to learn more? Certainly not from any intentional revelation either by Myrrhina or by Glycera, but only by overhearing something that passed between the two women. We know that he heard Glycera take an oath to Myrrhina (363). The scene is set for this in line 300. What he overheard was perhaps: "I swear that I will not reveal the fact that I am Moschion's sister." He perhaps heard only this because Myrrhina had brought Glycera to a particular shrine within his hearing in order to solemnize the oath. There is a parallel in the *Ethiopica* (IV, 18, 6) of Heliodorus, where the hearth of a private house is used as an altar for a solemn oath: ἐμοῦ . . . τὴν ἔστιαν ἐσχάραν εἰς βωμὸν ἀνάψαντος καὶ λιβανωτὸν ἀποθύσαντος ἐπώμυνεν ὁ Θεαγένης. Moschion would be too much overwhelmed by the blow to his prospects as lover of Glycera to seek further information at first. I can see no weakness in the plot as I have outlined it.

*Perikeiromene*, 394. Here Körte leaves a blank. I suggest a reading that fills the space and gives good sense:

(Πα) οὐκέτι καθέξω, φιλτάτ[η. (Μο) σκόπ]ει δ' ἐγώ  
τίς εἰμ]ι, τί προσέχεσθέ μ[οι.

"*Pataecus*. I will no longer restrain myself, dearest daughter. *Moschion*. But observe who I am, how you two are related to me."

L. A. Post.

HARVARD COLLEGE.

## THE EURIPIDES PAPYRI.

In my book on Euripides<sup>1</sup> published in 1930 I included in an appendix a list of the Euripides papyri known to me at that time, adding also a few other items in which the writing was on some other material than papyrus, such as vellum or a potsherd. During the last ten years other new fragments of Euripides in considerable number have been identified, so that it seems desirable to bring the list up to date. That has been done in this paper which also includes a few small fragments omitted from the earlier list. There are now 73 separate items<sup>2</sup> as compared with 42 in 1930. They are the following and, as before, include a few which are not papyri.

1. *Aegeus*. Two lines, the same as Fragment 11 (Nauck) with four additional words. On an ostrakon in Berlin. No. P. 12311. Part of a school exercise. P. Viereck, *Raccolta Lumbruso*, pp. 255 f. Date second half of third century B. C.
2. *Alcestis*, lines 1155-1163. See also ending of *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Helen* and, with change of one line, *Medea*. *Hibeh Papyri*, No. 25, pp. 113 f. Date 280-240 B. C.
3. *Alcmaeon at Corinth*. Two lines quoted in a work on literary criticism. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1611, lines 90 ff., Vol. XIII, pp. 127 ff. Date early third century A. D.
4. *Alexander*. About 150 badly broken lines besides various small fragments. Now in Strassburg. See B. Snell, *Hermes*, Einzelschriften, V (1937). Date first century B. C.
5. *Andromache*, lines 5-28 (omitting 7), 30-36, and 39-48. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 449, Vol. III, pp. 101 ff. Date third century A. D.

<sup>1</sup> *Euripides, A Student of Human Nature* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930).

<sup>2</sup> In *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 208 f. F. M. Heichelheim publishes a tiny fragment of papyrus in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, dating from the late first or early second century A. D. There are parts of eight lines, that is four on the recto and four on the verso, with three letters of each line preserved, but there is doubt about some of these. He would assign them to Euripides, *Hecuba*, 503-504, 20-21; *Iphigenia at Aulis*, 790-791; and Sophocles, *Antigone*, 689-690. In view of their uncertain character it seems advisable not to include them in this list of Euripides papyri.

6. *Andromache*, lines 907-914. *Rendel Harris Papyri*, No. 39, p. 26. Date early third century A. D.
7. *Andromache*, lines 957-959, 988-990, 1239-1242, and 1273-1276. *Papyri Russischer und Georgischer Sammlungen*, I: *Literarische Texte*, No. 8, pp. 58 f. Date second century A. D.
8. *Antiope*. 123 lines from end of play. Mahaffy in *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, Vol. I, pp. 1 ff. See also von Arnim, *Supplementum Euripideum*, pp. 18 ff. Date third century B. C.
9. *Archelaus*. Sixteen fragmentary lines. Cf. Fragment 247 (Nauck). *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 419, Vol. III, pp. 65 f. Date second or third century A. D.
10. *Cretans*. Fifty-two lines on a parchment leaf. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. 217, Vol. V, 2, pp. 73 ff. See also von Arnim, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 ff. Date second century A. D.
11. *Danaë*. Five lines from an anthology. Same as Fragment 326 (Nauck) omitting line 4. *Papyri Russischer und Georgischer Sammlungen*, I: *Literarische Texte*, No. 9, p. 60. Date second century A. D. See No. 49.
12. *Electra*. Part of the Hypothesis. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 420, Vol. III, pp. 66 ff. Date third century A. D.
13. *Electra*, lines 367-379. From an anthology. *Hibeh Papyri*, No. 7b, pp. 36 f. Date third century B. C.
14. *Electra*, lines 388-389. From a collection of sentences on an ostrakon in Berlin. No. P. 12319. *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1918, pp. 742 f., No. 6. Date second half of third century B. C. See No. 15.
15. *Hecuba*, lines 254-256. From a collection of sentences on an ostrakon in Berlin. No. P. 12319. *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1918, pp. 742 f., No. 10. Date second half of third century B. C. See No. 14.
16. *Hecuba*, lines 700-703 and 737-740. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 876, Vol. VI, pp. 182 f. Date fifth century A. D.
17. *Hecuba*, lines 1252-1269 and 1271-1280. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 877, Vol. VI, pp. 183 f. Date third century A. D.
18. *Hippolytus Crowned*, lines 243-367, 375-430, and 492-515. From a parchment book. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 5005, Vol. V, 2, pp. 88 ff. Date sixth century A. D.
19. *Hippolytus Crowned*, lines 403-423 with the omission of lines 405, 411, and 412, and with the addition of an interpolated

line after 407. From part of an anthology in Berlin. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9772, Vol. V, 2, p. 127. Date second century B. C. See Nos. 38 and 63.

20. *Hippolytus Crowned*, lines 616-624 on an ostrakon in Berlin. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 4758, Vol. V, 2, pp. 96 f. Date second century B. C.

21. *Hippolytus Crowned*, lines 664-668. From an anthology in Berlin. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9773, lines 7-11, Vol. V, 2, p. 129. Date second century B. C.

22. *Hypsipyle*. Parts of nearly 1700 lines in over 200 fragments, some of them very small. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 852, Vol. VI, pp. 19 ff. See also von Arnim, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff. Date late second or early third century A. D.

23. *Hypsipyle*. Twenty fragmentary lines identified by F. Petersen, *Hermes*, XLIX (1914), p. 156. *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, 49(c), now British Museum Papyri No. 590. Date not given.

24. *Hypsipyle* (?). Parts of nine lines. H. J. M. Milne (*Class. Rev.*, XL [1926], p. 64) thinks this fragment belongs to *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, 49(c). *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, 49(d) DX. Date not given.

25. *Ino*. Lines 3 and 4 of Fragment 407 (Nauck), quoted by Satyrus in his *Life of Euripides*, col. XVII, lines 1-7. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1176, Vol. IX, pp. 124 ff. Date second century A. D.

26. *Ino*. Lines 1, 2, 4, and 5 of Fragment 424 (Nauck) with syllables separated, in a school book with elementary exercises in reading, etc. O. Guéraud and P. Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J. C.*, lines 126-129. Cairo Museum No. 65445. Date latter part of third century B. C. See No. 55.

27. *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, lines 174-191 (omitting 178), 245-255, 272-286, 581-595, and 600-629 (omitting 628). *Hibeh Papyri*, No. 24, pp. 108 ff. Date 280-240 B. C.

28. *Medea*, lines 5-12. Weil, *Monuments Grecs*, No. 8, 1879, Pt. II, pp. 16 ff. Date before 161 B. C.

29. *Medea*, line 20 on a marble plaque at Delphi. *Bull. Cor. Hel.*, XLIX (1925), p. 88. Date third century B. C. See No. 54.

30. *Medea*, lines 20-26 and 57-63. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1370, Vol. XI, pp. 126 ff. Date fifth century A. D.

31. *Medea*, lines 507, 513-517, and 545-560. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. 243, Vol. V, 2, pp. 97 f. Date fifth century A. D.

32. *Medea* lines 710-715. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 450, Vol. III, p. 103. Date third century A. D.

33. *Medea*, lines 719-723, 1046-1053, 1279-1299, 1301-1319, and 1323-1328. *Rendel Harris Papyri*, No. 38, pp. 23 ff. Date second century A. D.

34. *Medea*, lines 843-844, 846-849, 852, 856, 859, 862, 865, 976-977, 979, 981, 1087-1115, 1251-1287, 1290-1292, and 1389-1419. From a roll containing lyric passages from Euripides written like prose. Now in Strassburg. N. Lewis, *Études de Papyrologie*, III (1936), pp. 52 ff. Cf. B. Snell, *Hermes*, Einzelschriften, V (1937), pp. 69 ff. Date third century B. C. See Nos. 40 and 60.

35. *Medea*, lines 1057-1062 and 1086-1092, much broken. Vellum fragment from Arsinoë now in London. H. J. M. Milne, *Class. Rev.*, XLIX (1935), p. 14. Date fourth or fifth century A. D.

36. *Medea*, lines 1156-1160, 1165-1177, and 1191-1199. In Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. *Class. Quarterly*, XXXII (1938), pp. 45 f. Date first or early second century A. D.

37. *Melanippe Desmotis*. Fifty lines, some consisting of a few letters only, from a parchment book. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 5514, Vol. V, 2, pp. 84 ff. Date fifth century A. D.

38. *Melanippe Desmotis*. Thirty-two lines from an anthology in Berlin. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9772, Vol. V, 2, pp. 125 f. The last four lines also quoted as from the *Protesilaus*. Date second century B. C. See Nos. 19 and 63.

39. *Melanippe Desmotis*. Lines 5-15 of No. 38 quoted in the *Life of Euripides* by Satyrus, col. XI, lines 1-30. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1176, Vol. IX, pp. 125 ff. Date second century A. D.

40. *Melanippe Desmotis* (?). Thirty-six broken lines from a roll which contained lyric passages from Euripides. Now in Strassburg. N. Lewis, *Études de Papyrologie*, III (1936), pp. 68 ff.; also B. Snell, *Hermes*, Einzelschriften, V (1937), pp. 78 ff. Date third century B. C. See Nos. 34 and 60.

41. *Oeneus* (?). Two small fragments the largest having parts of six lines. P. B. Grenfell, *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment*, Vol. II, p. 1. Date first century B. C.

42. *Oeneus* (?). Parts of seventy-eight lines. *Hibeh Papyri*, No. 4, pp. 21 ff. Date 300-280 B. C.

43. *Orestes*, lines 53-61 and 89-97. Leaf of vellum codex.

*Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1616, Vol. XIII, pp. 163 f. Date fifth century A. D.

44. *Orestes*, lines 226-247. At Columbia University, New York. *Class. Phil.*, XXXIII (1938), pp. 411 ff. Date first century B. C.

45. *Orestes*, lines 338-343 with musical notes attached. Cf. J. F. Mountford in Powell and Barber, *New Chapters in Greek Literature*, Second Series, p. 169. *Rainer Papyri*, No. 8029, Vol. V, pp. 65 ff. Date about 1 A. D.

46. *Orestes*, lines 445-449, 469-473, 482-486, 508-512, 685-690, 723-729, 811-817, 850-854, 896-898, 907-910, 924-936, 945-948, 1248-1262, 1297-1305, 1334-1345, and 1370-1371. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1370, Vol. XI, pp. 126 ff. Date fifth century A. D.

47. *Orestes*, lines 754-764. *Études de Papyrologie*, I (1932), pp. 15 f. Date late first or early second century A. D.

48. *Orestes*, lines 1062-1090 (omitting 1086 and 1087). Nicole, *R. de Philologie*, XIX (1895), pp. 105 ff. Date second or third century A. D.

49. *Orestes*, lines 1155-1156. From an anthology. *Papyri Russischer und Georgischer Sammlungen*, I: *Literarische Texte*, No. 9, p. 60. Date second century A. D. See No. 11.

50. *Orestes*, lines 1313-1350 and 1356-1360. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1178, Vol. IX, pp. 184 ff. Date early part of first century B. C.

51. *Phaethon*. Nineteen lines written as thirty-five. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9771, Vol. V, 2 pp. 79 ff. Date third century B. C.

52. *Phoenissae*, lines 105-118 and 128-140. Inscribed on an ostrakon by a school-boy. Many mistakes. *Class. Rev.*, XVIII (1904), p. 2. Date second century B. C.

53. *Phoenissae*, lines 171-185 and 200-226. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1177, Vol. IX, pp. 182 ff. Date early first century A. D.

54. *Phoenissae*, lines 529-530 much broken. On a marble plaque at Delphi. *Bull. Cor. Hel.*, XLIX (1925), p. 88. Date third century B. C. See No. 29.

55. *Phoenissae*, lines 529-535 with syllables separated, in a school book with elementary exercises in reading, etc. O. Guéraud and B. Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J. C.*, lines 115-125. Cairo Museum, No. 65445. Date latter part of third century B. C. See No. 26.

56. *Phoenissae*, lines 646-656. From Oxyrhynchus. *Cata-*

*logue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Vol. III, pp. 195 ff. Date second century A. D.

57. *Phoenissae*, lines 1017-1043 and 1064-1071. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 224, Vol. II, pp. 114 ff. Date third century A. D.

58. *Phoenissae*, lines 1027-1048. From Oxyrhynchus, now in Florence. *Papyri Greci e Latini*, No. 1193, Vol. XI, p. 70. Date second century A. D.

59. *Phoenissae*, lines 1097-1107 and 1126-1137. On a wooden tablet. *Rainer Papyri*, Vol. V, pp. 74 ff. Date fourth or fifth century A. D.

60. *Phoenissae*, lines 1500-1581, 1710-1730, and 1733-1736. From a roll containing lyric passages from Euripides written like prose. Now in Strassburg. N. Lewis, *Études de Papyrologie*, III (1936), pp. 52 ff. Date third century B. C. See Nos. 34 and 40.

61. *Phoenissae*. Excerpts from scholia. Eighty-six lines, some much broken. From Hermopolis, now in Würzburg. On verso scholia on lines 344, 347, 417, 574, 631, 638 ff., 640, 651, and 657; on recto scholia on lines 683, 730, 808, 606, 23, 43, 982, 90, 1019-1020, 1023, 1028, 1033, 1043, 1046, and 1108. Wilcken, *Abhand. der Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1933, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, No. 6, pp. 7 ff. Date sixth century A. D.

62. *Phoenix*. Fragment 809 (Nauck), lines 8 and 9 quoted in a rhetorical treatise. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 410, lines 103 ff., Vol. III, pp. 26 ff. Date latter half of second century A. D.

63. *Protesilaus*. The four lines of Fragment 658 (Nauck) are found in an anthology in Berlin quoted as belonging to the *Melanippe Desmotis*. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9772, Vol. V, 2, p. 126 (col. V, lines 2-5). Date second century B. C. See Nos. 19 and 38.

64. *Protesilaus*. Three of the four lines of Fragment 658 (No. 63 above) in an anthology in Berlin. *Berl. Klassikertexte*, No. P. 9773, Vol. V, 2, p. 129, lines 1-3. Date second century B. C.

65. *Rhesus*. Twenty-five lines of the Hypothesis; also eight lines of the Hypothesis of the spurious *Rhadamanthys*. From Oxyrhynchus. C. Gallavotti, *Rivista di Filologia*, XI (1933), pp. 177 ff. Date second century A. D. See No. 68.

66. *Rhesus*, lines 48-96, i. e. 48-70 and 71-96. In Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Wilcken, *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1887, pp. 813 ff. Date fourth or fifth century A. D.

67. *Sciron*. Part of the Hypothesis with broken lines of the beginning of the play, fifteen fragmentary lines in all. *Amherst Papyri*, Vol. II, No. 17. Date sixth or seventh century A. D.

68. *Scyrians*. Part of line 1 and sixteen lines of the Hypothesis. From Oxyrhynchus. C. Gallavotti, *Rivista di Filologia*, XI (1933), pp. 177 ff.; also A. Körte, *Hermes*, LXIX (1934), pp. 1 ff. Date second century A. D. See No. 65.

69. *Telephus*. Fifteen and one-half lines from the beginning of the play. In Milan. *Aegyptus*, XV (1935), pp. 239 ff. Date second century B. C.

70. *Telephus* (?). Nineteen lines from a play dealing with the Telephus story. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Vol. III, pp. 92 ff. Date second century A. D.

71. *Temenidae* (?). Forty-four lines in two copies, i. e. the same lines are repeated on the recto and the verso of the papyrus. Weil, *Monuments Grecs*, No. 8, 1879, Pt. I, pp. 2 ff. Date before 161 B. C.

72. *Troades*, lines 876-879 on a wax tablet. *Berl. Klassiker-texte*, No. NR. 17651, Vol. V, 2, p. 98. Date first century A. D.

73. *Life of Euripides* by Satyrus. *Oxy. Pap.*, No. 1176, Vol. IX, pp. 124 ff.; also von Arnim, *op. cit.*, pp. 3 ff. Date second century A. D.

WILLIAM NICKERSON BATES.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE INDO-EUROPEAN BASE-TYPE \*do-, \*do-ie-,  
\*do-əe-, \*do-ɔe-.

From a purely theoretic and schematic point of view, one should have, corresponding to the Indo-European diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi* and *au*, *eu*, *ou*, whose second components are the pre-palatal semivowel [j] and the bilabial semivowel [w] respectively, a third series whose second component should be of post-vocalic quality. That this element was a semivowel (here written *ə* or *ɔ*) corresponding to the surd pharyngal spirant [h], which appears in Hittite intervocally as *hh*, and which coalesced elsewhere in Indo-European with a preceding [a], [e], and [o] into [a:], [e:], and [o:],<sup>1</sup> seems evident from such correspondences as Hittite *newahhun* "I renewed": Greek *νεᾶν* < \**nefā-εσεν* < \**nefa<sup>2</sup>-εσεν* (cf. also Latin *novāre* < \**novā-esi*); Hittite *tehhi* "I place": Greek *τίθημι*, Latin *fēcī*, Old Church Slavic *dě-ti*; Hittite *dahhi* "I take": Greek *δίδωμι*, Latin *dō-num*, Lithuanian *dúo-mi*.

One would have, then, the following alternations:

NR	NZ	RN	RR	RZ	ZN	ZR	ZZ
<i>eie</i>	<i>éie</i> > <i>éia</i>	<i>ei</i> = <i>ei</i>	<i>eié</i> > <i>aié</i>	<i>ei</i> > <i>aia</i>	<i>ei</i> > <i>i</i>	<i>ié</i> = <i>ié</i>	<i>i</i> > <i>ia</i>
<i>eue</i>	<i>éue</i> > <i>éya</i>	<i>eu</i> = <i>eu</i>	<i>eué</i> > <i>ayé</i>	<i>eu</i> > <i>aya</i>	<i>eu</i> > <i>ū</i>	<i>ué</i> = <i>ué</i>	<i>u</i> = <i>u</i>
<i>eəe</i>	<i>éəe</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>eo</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>eəé</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>eə</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>eə</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>əé</i> > <i>ə</i>	<i>ə</i> = <i>ə</i>

In view of all this, and especially in the light of the type of Hittite *tehhi*: Greek *τίθημι*, it would appear that the supposed Indo-European bases ending in a long vowel were, in reality, bases ending in a short vowel plus *ə*e or *ə*, which would seem to have been determinatives<sup>3</sup> of the same character as *ie:i* and

<sup>1</sup> This study represents a complete revision of my article "Vocalic Alternation in the Disyllabic Base in Indo-European" in this JOURNAL, LI (1930), pp. 273-285. Taking the base-type as \**xecē-i*, I was then unable to explain what I there called the "shortened grade," and I was wrong in considering the final *-i/-u* as part of the primitive base. On the phonetic value of the laryngals (or pharyngals?) see, most recently, E. H. Sturtevant, in *Language*, XVI (1940), pp. 81-87.

<sup>2</sup> The developments of *ai*e, *oi*o, *eua*, *oue*, *eəo* are exactly analogous. N, R, Z denote the normal, reduced, and zero-grades respectively.

<sup>3</sup> This term here comprises both the "suffixe" and the "élargissement" of E. Benveniste (*Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*, I [Paris, 1935], p. 148, etc.). On the other hand, I am still

ue: *u*, *æe*, *ie*, and *ue* being zero-normal grades of the determinative-bases *eæe*, *eie*, and *eue*, and *ø*, *i*, and *u* being their corresponding double-zero grades.

As a particularly wide-spread example of such a base, which will show all the principles involved, we may take \**do-* "give,"<sup>4</sup> which appears historically in the four types \**do-*, \**do-i(e)-*, \**do-u(e)-*, \**do-ø(e)-* > \**dō(e)-*, besides the compound types \**do-ue-ie-*, \**do-øe-ie-*, \**do-øe-ue-*, \**do-øe-ue-ie* actually found, and the hypothetically possible \**do-ie-ue-*, \**do-ie-øe-*, \**do-ue-øe-*.

From the purely theoretic point of view, these bases should show the following grades in Indo-European (*mutatis mutandis*, the base-types \**do-ue-ie-*, etc., show analogous grades) :

N, NR	N, NZ	R, RN	RR	RZ	ZN	ZR	ZZ
<i>do-</i>	<i>dō-</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>-</i>				
<i>doie-</i>	<i>dōi-</i>	<i>dōi-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>ié-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>i-</i>	<i>d<sub>i</sub>é-</i>	<i>d<sub>i</sub>e-</i>	<i>di</i>
<i>doue-</i>	<i>dōu-</i>	<i>dōu-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>ué-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>u-</i>	<i>d<sub>u</sub>é-</i>	<i>d<sub>u</sub>e-</i>	<i>du</i>
<i>doøe-</i>	<i>dōø-</i>	<i>dōø-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>øé-</i>	<i>d<sub>o</sub>ø-</i>	<i>d<sub>ø</sub>é-</i>	<i>d<sub>ø</sub>e-</i>	<i>dø</i>

The actual historical representatives of these base-types we may now consider in the order just given.

1) \**do-*. N \**dó-*: Sanskrit *dátra-*, Greek *δότης* "gift," Venetic *zoto* "gave" (cf. Gk. *ἔδορο*), Lithuanian *priē-das* "addition"; R \**d<sub>o</sub>-*: Sanskrit *daah* (written *dāh*) "mayest thou give,"<sup>5</sup> Greek *δίδοται* "is given," *δότος*, Latin *datus* "given"; Z \**d-*: Sanskrit *deva-ttā- < \*-d-tó-* "god-given," *di-t-sati* "wishes to give," Old Latin *de-d-et*, Latin *de-d-it*, Gaulish *ðe-ð-ε*, Old Irish *dorat < \*to-pro-de-d-e* "has given," Latin *Consus < \*kom-d-tó-*, Lithuanian *dúomi* "I give," Old Church Slavic *dami* "I shall give" < \**dōd-mi*.<sup>6</sup>

unconvinced that the type of the Indo-European base was \**bher-* rather than \**bhere-*; and I may also remark that I am not yet prepared to state that Indo-European did not possess the three vowels *a*, *e*, *o*.

\* For the material see especially Walde-Pokorny, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1930-33), I, pp. 814-816; Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed., I (Heidelberg, 1938), pp. 360-363, 861; W. D. Whitney, *Roots, Verbs-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language* (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 71-72.

<sup>5</sup> E. V. Arnold, *Vedic Metre* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 91; H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (Leipzig, 1873), col. 590.

<sup>6</sup> For the reduplication syllable *dō-* instead of \**de-* see W. Vondrák, *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik*, 2nd ed., I (Göttingen, 1924), p. 705;

2) \**do-ie-*. NZ \**dó-i-*: Sanskrit *déya-* “to be given”; RZ \**dōi-* > \**dī-*: Sanskrit *dīyáte* “is given”; ZN \**dié-*: Sanskrit *dadyámāna-* “granted”; ZZ \**di-*: Sanskrit *vyā-dita-* “opened” (mouth),<sup>7</sup> *ádiśi* “je me donnai.”

3) \**do-ue-*. NZ \**dóu-*: Arcadian *ἀπν-δοας* < \**apo-dóūnts* “giving back,” Lithuanian *dāvęs* “having given”; RN \**dōuē-*: Cyprian *δοφεναι* “to give” (for the accentuation cf. Greek *διδόναι*),<sup>8</sup> Spanish Vulgar Latin *davo*, *dabo* “I give,”<sup>9</sup> Old Church Slavic *davati* < \**dōuō-ti* “to give”; RZ \**dōu-* > \**dū-*: Cyprian *δυφενοι* “should give.”<sup>10</sup>

4) \**do-əe-*. NZ \**dōə-* > \**dō-*: Sanskrit *dāti-* “act of giving,” Doric *δᾶτις* “gift, dowry,” Latin *dōt-* “dowry,” Old Prussian *dāt*, Lithuanian *dūoti*, Old Church Slavic *dati* “to give,” Armenian *tur*, Greek *δῶπον*, Old Church Slavic *darū* “gift,” Gaulish *Con-dātis* “Condat (Gironde)”; RZ \**dōə-* > \**dō-*: Sanskrit *dādāti*, Greek *δίδωσι* “gives,” Latin *dōnum*, Old Irish *dán*, Lithuanian *dūonis*, Old Church Slavic *danū* “gift,” Armenian *etu* < \**é-dō* “I gave” (cf. Sanskrit *ádām*); ZZ \**də-*: Sanskrit *dādīvánt-* “having given,” Latin *dedimus* < \**dedamos* < \**dē-də-mos* “we have given,” Albanian *dhashë* < \**də-sm* “I gave,” *dhënë* < \**də-nó-* “given.”

5) \**do-ue-je-*. NRZ \**dóuēi-* > \**dōuī-*: Faliscan *douiad* “gives,”<sup>11</sup> Umbrian *pur-douitu*, *pur-tuvetu* “porricito”; ZRZ

Meillet-Vaillant, *Le Slave commun*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1934), pp. 207-208, make the pre-form \**dō-də-ti*.

<sup>7</sup> Since -*ie-* characterises the Sanskrit passive, the *i* of -*dita-* seems to be from *i* rather than from the *ə* which appears in the perfect active participle *dādīvánt-*.

<sup>8</sup> For other possible explanations of *δοφεναι* see E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I (Munich, 1939), p. 808.

<sup>9</sup> A. C. Jennings, *A Linguistic Study of the Cartulario de San Vicente de Oviedo* (New York, 1940), p. 116.

<sup>10</sup> Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd ed. (Strasbourg, 1897-1916), II, iii, p. 17, derives the form from \**duȳnno-* (for the formation in general, *ibid.*, pp. 313-324), but, since all other Greek verbs of this type have a long vowel before -*avw* (e.g., *θηγάνω* “I whet”), there seems to be no cogent reason to assume *ü* (i.e. ZZ) here unless the form be a second aorist rather than a present. The *f* is apparently a glide-sound (Brugmann-Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*, 4th ed. [Munich, 1913], p. 53).

<sup>11</sup> For the denominative formation < \**douia* “gift,” cf. Umbrian *anseriatō* “observatum,” *combifiatō* “nuntiato,” Marrucinian *auiatas* “auspicatae,” Latin *propitiare* “propitiate,” a type which was greatly

\*d<sub>u</sub>ei- > \*d<sub>u</sub>i-: Old Latin *duim* < \*- - - *d*<sub>u</sub>e*im* “may I give” (cf. *perduint* < \*pér-*d*<sub>u</sub>ent “may they destroy”), Umbrian *pur-ditom*, *pur-titu* < \**por-d*<sub>u</sub>ei-*tó*- “porrectum.”

6) *do-æe-ie-*. NZR \**d*<sub>o</sub>ə*je*- > \**d*<sub>ō</sub>i*e*-: Sanskrit *dāya-* “act of giving,” Old Prussian *dāia* “gift”; RZZ \**d*<sub>o</sub>ə*i*- > \**d*<sub>ō</sub>i-: Sanskrit (á)*dāyi* “was given,” Old Church Slavic *daję* “I give” (for the accentuation cf. Sanskrit *gopāyāti* “acts as herdsman”); ZZZ \**d*<sub>ə</sub>*i*: Sanskrit *deyām* “may I give” (for accent cf. *asyām*), *deṣná-* “gift,” Armenian *tam* “I give.”

7) \**do-æe-ue-*. NZZ \**d*<sub>o</sub>ə*u*- > \**d*<sub>ō</sub>u-: Sanskrit *dāvan-* “giving”; RZN \**d*<sub>o</sub>ə*u**é*- > \**d*<sub>ō</sub>u*é*-: Sanskrit *dāváne* “to give,” Lithuanian *dovana* “gift.”

8) \**do-æe-ue-ie-*. RZNZ \**d*<sub>o</sub>ə*u**éi*- > \**d*<sub>ō</sub>*uei*-: Old Church Slavic *davaję* “I give.”<sup>12</sup>

It would seem, moreover, that *æ* appears in Indo-European not merely as an affixed determinative, but also, like *-n-*, as an infix. Thus we have for \**uele-* “turn” (Walde-Pokorny, I, pp. 298-304) not only the extensions \**uele-je-*, \**uele-ue-*, and \**uele-æ-*, but also \**ue-æ-le-* in Sanskrit *cakra-vāla-* “circle,” Armenian *gil* “round stone,” Anglo-Saxon *wélan* “twist around, bind” < \**uel-*; and for \**dere-* “flay, split” (I, pp. 797-803) not only \**dere-je-*, \**dere-ue-*, and \**dere-æ-*, but also \**de-æ-re-* in Sanskrit *dāri-* “cleft” (contrast *dīrná-* < \**d*<sub>er</sub>*enó-* “split”), Greek δῆρις “battle,” Old Church Slavic *u-dariti* “strike.” This formation is very frequent,<sup>13</sup> but the following instances will

extended in Late and Vulgar Latin (cf. H. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 2nd ed. [Marburg, 1875], pp. 155-171).

<sup>12</sup> For Slavic verbs in *-aja-* see Meillet-Vaillant, pp. 226-229. Among bases of a type similar to that of \**do-*, etc., mention may be made of \**garegē-* “shining, white” (Walde-Pokorny, I, pp. 82-83), \**ære-* “move” (I, pp. 136-142), \**uele-* “turn” (I, pp. 298-304), \**gene-* “rub” (I, pp. 392-397), \**kere-* “top” (I, pp. 403-408), \**ghene-* “gnaw” (I, pp. 584-585), \**ghere-* “rub” (I, pp. 605-606, 646-647, 648-650), \**gele-* “round” (I, pp. 612-621), \**ghele-* “shine” (I, pp. 624-627), \**gūere-* “heavy” (I, pp. 684-686), \**da-* “divide” (I, pp. 763-767), \**dere-* “flay, split” (I, pp. 797, 803), \**bhere-* “seethe” (II, pp. 157-159, 167-168), \**bhere-* “cut” (II, pp. 159-161, 194-196), \**bhele-* “swell” (II, pp. 176-178, 210-211, 212-214), \**mene-* “think” (II, pp. 264-266), \**mele-* “rub, grind” (II, pp. 284-290), \**seqe-* “cut” (II, pp. 474-476, 541-545, 552-553, 559-563, 573-587), \**sta-* “stand” (II, pp. 603-610), \**stere-* “stiff” (II, pp. 627-635), \**stere-* “ray, streak” (II, pp. 636-638), and \**spere-* “strew, spurt” (II, pp. 670-672).

<sup>13</sup> Omitting all bases which seem to be purely onomatopoetic, some

perhaps suffice to show the principles involved. The base \**rege-* "direct, rule" (Walde-Pokorny, II, pp. 347-348, 362-365, the base-form was really, as the Greek shows, \**gerege-*) appears in Sanskrit *rjū-* "straight," Greek ὁρέγω "reach, stretch," Latin *regō* "direct," *rogō* "ask" < "direct one's self to," Old Irish *recht* "law, droit," Gothic *raihts* "straight, right," Old Icelandic *rekja* "spread out, track"; but \**re-ge-ge-* is seen in Sanskrit *rāj-*, Latin *rēx*, Old Irish *rī* "king" (Gaulish *Rīgo-magus* "King's Plain"), Greek ἀρήγω "succour," Old Icelandic *rák* "streak"; \**kerde-* "heart" (I, p. 423) in Greek *καρδία*, Latin *cord-*, Old Irish *críde* < \**kṛdīo-*, Gothic *hairto*, Lithuanian *širdis* "heart," but \**ke-ge-rde-* in Armenian *sirt*, Greek κῆρ, Old Prussian *seyr* "heart," Old Church Slavic *sředa* "centre"; \**tereb-* "beam" (I, pp. 757-758) in Latin *trabs* "beam," Old Irish *treb* "abode, tribe," but \**tere-ge-be-* in Greek τέμπανον < \**terəb-no-* "chamber, house," Oscan *trībūm*, Lithuanian *trobà* "house," Old Church Slavic *trěmū* "tower."

In addition to the -*ge*- infixes, we find those in -*ie-* and -*ye-*.<sup>14</sup> At least three bases show -*ie-* beside -*ge-*: \**reqe-* "pole, stick" (II, pp. 346-347, 351), seen in Old Icelandic *rá* < \**rahō* < \**roqā* "landmark," shows \**re-ge-qi-* in Lithuanian *rékles* "drying-frame," and \**re-ie-ge* in Old High German *rigel* "bolt, bar," Lithuanian *rýkštē* "rod"; \**(ge)rege*, already cited, shows

seventy-five are recorded by Walde-Pokorny which apparently fall within this category, notably \**era(əo)se-* "flow" (I, pp. 149-151), \**ye(əe)ge-* "spin" (I, pp. 247-248), \**ye(əe)ne-* "desire" (I, pp. 259-260), \**ye(əe)re-* "true" (I, pp. 285-286), \**ke(əe)rde-* "heart" (I, p. 423), \**ke(əe)le-* "hide" (I, pp. 432-433), \**qe(əe)le-* "speckled, darkish" (I, pp. 440-442), \**tere(əe)be-* "beam" (I, pp. 757-758), \**de(əe)me-* "build" (I, pp. 786-788), \**de(əe)le-* "split" (I, pp. 810-811), \**ple(əe)te-* "spread" (II, pp. 99-100), \**bhe(əe)re-* "bear" (II, pp. 153-157), \**ne(əo)de-* "twist" (II, pp. 328-329), \**re(əe)ge-* "direct, rule" (II, pp. 362-365), \**se(əe)me-* "one, same" (II, pp. 488-492).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. J. Schrijnen, "i et u informatifs en indo-européen" in *Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Joannis Rozwadowski*, I (Cracow, 1927), pp. 119-123 = *Collectanea Schrijnen* (Nijmegen and Utrecht, 1939), pp. 139-143. The theory of H. Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, I (Heidelberg, 1927), pp. 291-295, that i and u were lost postconsonantly in such cases seems contrary to fact. For possible Semitic infixes -ia-, -ya-, -a- (the latter = [ʔa]), giving the types \**ka(iə/uə/a)ta(iə/uə/a)ba*, see L. H. Gray, *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics* (New York, 1934), pp. 36-40.

\*re-*ie*-*ge*- in Middle Irish *ri-n-gim* "torture, hang," Old High German *reichen* "reach," Lithuanian *raižytis* "stretch one's limbs," *réižtis* "strain one's self"; beside \**la-ze-pe* "shine, burn" (II, p. 383), seen in Greek *λα-μ-πάς* "torch," Old Irish *lassar* < \**ləp-s-aro-*, Old Prussian *lopis* "flame," \**le-je-pe-* appears in Old Icelandic *leiptr* "lightning," Lithuanian *liepsnà* "flame"; and beside \**sa-za-dhe-* "succeed" (II, p. 450) in Sanskrit *sādhati* < \**sādh-eti*, *sadhnoti* < \**sādh-n-éuti* "succeed," *sādhú-* < \**sādhú-* "successful," *siddhá-* < \**sādh-tó-* "fulfilled," stands Greek *ἴθις* < \**sādh-ú-* "straight." As an example of the infix -*ue-* we may cite \**se-ue-ghe-* "anxious, ill" in Sanskrit *sūrkṣati* < \**sāurgh-s-éti* "heed," Albanian *dergjem* < \**súorghiō* "be ill," Gothic *saúrga* "anxiety," beside \**serghe-* in Middle Irish *serg* "illness," Lithuanian *siřgti* "be ill," Old Church Slavic *sraga* "illness" (II, p. 529).

The base \*(*k*)*sele-* "beam, board" (II, pp. 503-504) shows a particularly interesting series: \*(*k*)*sele-* in Anglo-Saxon *sealma* "couch," Old Lithuanian *šalma* "long beam"; \*(*k*)*sel-ze-* in Old Church Slavic *slěma* "beam"; \*(*k*)*se-je-le-* in Lithuanian *sýle* "trough"; \*(*k*)*se-ue-le-* in Greek ξύλον "wood," Lithuanian *šūlas* "pillar, post" < \**ksuló-*, Greek σέλμα < \**suel-mēnt-* "ship's deck," Gothic *sauls* < \**sóulos*, Old High German *sül* < \**sulā* "pillar," Anglo-Saxon *syll* < \**sul-iā* "sill," Old High German *swelli* < \**suél-ijs* "threshold"; \*(*k*)*se-ue-ze-le-* in Lithuanian *súolas* < \**suoełó-* "bench"; and \*(*k*)*se-ze-le-* in Albanian *gjollë* < \**səłā* "plate for cattle-salt."

As regards the meanings of the infixes -*i(e)-*, -*u(e)-*, -*z(e)-* < -*eie-*, -*eue-*, -*eze-*, it seems possible to make some suggestions. The first of these infixes would appear to be identical with the relative base \**eie-*, which is an important formative in nouns, which is characteristic of denominative and causative verbs (the latter themselves denominative in origin), which is perhaps seen in the relative pronoun \**jo-* "who," and which may play a rôle in the inflexion of the noun.<sup>15</sup> The base \**eue-* appears as a

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Brugmann, II, i, pp. 166-175, 182-199; Gray in *Language*, VIII (1932), pp. 186-187, where the form of the base is to be corrected in the light of the present study; cf. also his "Sur l'infexion des prétendus thèmes en -i," in *B. S. L. P.*, XXXI (1931), pp. 34-42, and his *Foundations of Language* (New York, 1939), pp. 158-159; and especially Benveniste, *Origines*, I, pp. 50-86.

formative both of nouns and of verbs;<sup>16</sup> and both would seem to have had a meaning of relativity.

A possible clue to the meaning of the determinative -*qe-* may be found in the Hittite -*hhi*-conjugation of the types of *tehhi* < \**dhé-q-i* "I place": Greek *τίθημι*, *dahhi* < \**dó-q-i* "I take," etc., : Greek *δίθωμι*, with -*i* instead of \*-*a* by analogy with the -*mi*-conjugation. Sturtevant has recently shown that the inflexion of this -*hhi*-conjugation corresponds to that of the Indo-European perfect (cf. Hittite *dahhi*, *dati*, *dai*: Greek *οἶδα*, *οἶσθα*, *οἴδε*);<sup>17</sup> and also that certain Greek perfects show traces of former existence of the laryngal [h].<sup>18</sup> Since the meaning of the perfect is essentially "the present result of an experience or act completed in the past,"<sup>19</sup> all this would appear to imply that the formative and infixional -*qe-* denoted completion, perfection, and the like.

The theory of an infix -*qe-* seems to explain a number of phenomena whose interpretations have hitherto been rather strained or regarded merely as prolonged grades having no con-

<sup>16</sup> Brugmann, II, i, pp. 176-182, 199-208, iii, pp. 156-157, 269-272, 324-326.

<sup>17</sup> "Source of Hittite *hi*-Conjugation," in *Language*, XIV (1938), pp. 10-17; in a supplementary note (pp. 17-19), G. Bechtel aptly compares it with that of the Teutonic preterito-presents; in two papers, "Les Désinences hittites -*bi*, -*ti*, -*i* du présent et -*ta* du parfait," in *Mélanges Franz Cumont*, II (Brussels, 1936), pp. 551-573 and "Le Verbe hittite et le type thématique," in *Mélanges Émile Boisacq*, I (Brussels, 1937), pp. 206-218. W. Couvreur holds that the -*hhi*-verbs are perfective-punctual and the -*mi*-verbs imperfective-durative (with a citation of my note "Athematic Verbs Durative, Thematic Verbs Momentary," in *Language*, IX [1933], pp. 82-84).

<sup>18</sup> "The Greek Aspirated Perfect," in *Language*, XVI (1940), pp. 179-182 (cf. also his discussion of "The Greek *κ*-Perfect and Indo-European -*k(o)*," *ibid.*, pp. 273-284). For a collection of material of these types see Brugmann-Thumb, p. 375; G. Meyer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 637-638; for totally different explanations, see Meillet-Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques* (Paris, 1924), pp. 207-209; Schwyzler, pp. 771-772.

<sup>19</sup> Brugmann, II, iii, pp. 768-769; L. Renou, *La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques* (Paris, 1925); P. Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris, 1927); cf. the Latin translation of (*χρόνος*) *παρακελμένος* by "(tempus) perfectum" and the Armenian rendering, in the Armenian version of Dionysius Thrax, by *yarakay* "permanent." My pupil, Gordon Harper Marsh, has in preparation a volume on the Indo-European perfect as a whole.

nection with the prolonged grade proper of the types of Sanskrit *pát* < \**péd-s* "foot," *padás*, Greek *πούς* (Doric *πως*, Hesychius), *ποδός*, Latin *pēs*, *pedis*; Sanskrit *tāṣṭi* "fashions" beside *tákṣati* < \**tékb(e)ti*.

At least one of these phenomena directly concerns the perfect. The type of Latin *sēdērunt*, Gothic *setun* "they (have) sat" beside the presents *sedeō*, *sitan* "sit," Lithuanian *sēdēs*, Old Church Slavic *sēdū* "having sat," is currently explained as from \**sēzd-* < \**sēsēd-*, but would seem, rather, to have arisen from \**sēd-*, the reduced-zero-grade of \**se-ȝe-de-*. The type also appears in such Old Irish verbs as *r-a-mídar* "I have judged him" beside the present *midiur* "puto," comparable with Gothic *us-metun* "they have lived" beside the present *us-mitan* "to behave" (cf. Greek *μήδομαι* "I intend," Armenian *mit* "mind" beside Greek *μέδομαι* "I am mindful," Latin *meditor* "I meditate," Old Irish *mess* < \**mēd-tu* "judgment," etc.).<sup>20</sup>

Moreover, intensive perfectives of the type of Sanskrit *jā-gar-ti*, *jā-gār-a* "is, has been wakeful," Greek *ἐ-γρή-γορ-α* "I am awake," *δη-δέχ-εται* "they welcome," *νη-νέ-ω* "pile up"<sup>21</sup> seem explicable by the same principle, so that *jāgarti* would be from \**gē-ə-gor-ti*, *ἐγρήγορα* from \**é-ğre-ə-ğor-a*, etc. The type of Sanskrit *bhārā-* "burden," Greek *φώρ*, Latin *fūr* "thief," Old High German *-bāri* "bearing" < \**bhōer-* appears to be of like provenance, as does the numerous Sanskrit type of *mānavá-* < \**mē-ə-n-e-uó-* "human": *mánu-* "man," i. e., relative to man as an entity.

In the light of the data here presented, it would appear that

<sup>20</sup> For the type in general, see Brugmann, II, iii, pp. 433-435; Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th ed. (Munich, 1928), p. 332; E. Kieckers, *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik* (Munich, 1928), pp. 208-209; H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, II (Göttingen, 1909-13), p. 388. The type of Sanskrit *papāca* "he has cooked": *pácati* "cooks" seems to be derived from \**pe-pé-ə-ke*; for those of Sanskrit *pece* "I have cooked for myself," *sedúr* "they are seated" I know as yet of no satisfactory explanation (for hypotheses see J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I [Göttingen, 1896], pp. 37-39; Thumb-Hirt, *Handbuch des Sanskrit* [Heidelberg, 1930], pp. 355, 362-363, 510, 511; Brugmann, II, iii, pp. 433-436, 454). (For the problem of *sedúr*, etc., see now Marsh, "The Voiced Sibilants in Sanskrit," in *J. A. O. S.*, LXI [1941], pp. 45-50.)

<sup>21</sup> Brugmann, II, iii, pp. 23, 27, 112, 430; the view of Schwyzer, p. 648, that the long vowel here is probably due to metrical lengthening seems rather unlikely.

the base-types \*xeice-, \*xeuce-, and \*xece- were, in reality, formed from \*xece- by means of the infixes -*i*(e)-, -*u*(e)-, and -*ə*(e)- respectively, these amalgamations being governed by their various regular gradations, so that their original forms must have been \*xece-, \*xe-i-e-ce-, \*xe-u-e-ce-, and \*xe-ə-e-ce-. In the historic period, the overwhelming majority of Indo-European bases appear to have been of the disyllabic type \*xece-, which could be extended by various suffixes, enlargements, and infixes; and many of these bases would seem to have been compounds dating from an earlier stage of Indo-European, although, by the period immediately preceding the appearance of the historic Indo-European languages, their compound nature had been utterly obscured and forgotten.<sup>22</sup> Beside these disyllabic bases there were, however, in my present opinion, a relatively small number of monosyllabic bases, such as \*do-, which seem to admit of no further analysis, and which must belong to a very early stage of Indo-European.<sup>23</sup>

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

<sup>22</sup> My pupil, Benjamin Schwartz, is preparing a volume on *The Root and its Modification in Primitive Indo-European*.

<sup>23</sup> Similarly, in Semitic, beside the great majority of trisyllabic bases (e.g., \*kataba "write"), there are several disyllabic bases (e.g., \*abu "father") and even a few monosyllabic (e.g., \*pu "mouth"); cf. Gray, *Introduction*, pp. 34, 38; C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I (Berlin, 1908), pp. 331-334. Schwartz holds that \*do- is not truly a monosyllabic base but comes from an earlier \*de<sub>ə</sub>e-, although felt and treated as a monosyllabic root by late Indo-European times.

#### FOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR SENECA, E. M. CIV.

The one hundred and fourth of Seneca's *Moral Epistles* seems to present an unusual ratio of cruxes to text; the accompanying notes seek to deal with four of these. The number-references in brackets indicate the page and line in Hense's second edition.

I continue once again in the conventional way to record readings as being vouched for by BA, but I believe that B. Axelson<sup>1</sup> has fully confirmed the doubts raised by Aemilius Hermes as far back as 1876 as to the independent value of A, and that any subsequent editor of the *Epistles* is for the most part dispensed from the obligation of reporting A at all.

CIV, 11 (498, 23) : quicquid te delectat, aequē vide † ut videres  
dum vireret uter: alium alio die casus excutiet.

BA: *vide ut*; Q: *videt aut.* QBA: *videres* (conjoined with *aut* in Q). B: *vireret*; QA: *viveret*. QBA: *uter*, after which there is a stop in B and, according to Hense (II), in A; Beltrami otherwise.

I propose to write out first what the preceding sentence seems to mean, then to attempt a reasonable continuation of the thought of that sentence, and finally to see what relation that bears or may be made to bear to the manuscript readings.

Going back then to *gravissimum* I translate as follows: "You will judge it a very grave affliction to lose some one of those to whom you will (at that time) be devoted, though this will be as out of place as to shed tears because the leaves are falling from the lovely trees that set off your house." I continue the thought thus: "Whatever delights you, look upon it exactly as you do on green leaves: while they flourish, make the most of them; this one today, another tomorrow, chance will knock from its place."

In comparing this with the manuscript readings one encounters the first difficulty in *ut*. Seneca does not write *aeque . . . ut*, but *aeque . . . quam* or *aeque . . . ac*.<sup>2</sup> In minuscules, however, *ac* to *at* to *ut* is no difficult transition, and the *aut* of Q may preserve traces of this process.

<sup>1</sup> "Der Codex Argentoratensis C VI 5," *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund*, 1936-7, No. III.

<sup>2</sup> H. Mueck, *Dissertatio Inauguralis* (Marburg, 1890), p. 16.

*Videres* I assume to be the residuum of an original *virides* <*frondes vides*>. Identity of ending, plus a general resemblance between *virides* and <*vides*>, caused the loss of <*frondes vides*>, and the isolated *virides* was next misread *videres* through a most natural error. Successive deteriorations now attacked *dum virent*, the verb appearing as *vireret* or *viveret*; with the loss of <*frondes*> there was nothing any longer left to assist in maintaining a third plural verb like *virent*. *Utere* was also left high and dry to become the impossible *uter*, and *aliam*, with no gender-controlling <*frondes*> remaining, became *alium*.

Reassembling these points, I think that the manuscript reading must originally have been substantially this: *quicquid te delectat, aeque vide ac virides* <*frondes vides*> : *dum virent, utere; aliam alio dies casus excutiet*. This is, with the exception of *ac* for *ut* and the addition of <*vides*> for the clausula rhythm, what Windhaus worked out sixty years ago on the basis of the excellent suggestions already offered by Haase.<sup>3</sup>

The three clausula rhythms are successively: (1) -des <*frondes vides*>, spondee plus cretic; (2) *dum virent, utere*, double cretic; (3) *casus excutiet*, cretic plus trochée, with resolution of the long syllable of the trochée. This, I think, is of considerable significance in enabling one to feel that he has arrived at something like the truth in a passage so corrupt.

CIV, 15 (499, 24) : *peregrinatio notitiam dabit gentium, novas tibi montium formas ostendet, invisitata spatia camporum et inriguas perennibus aquis valles, alicuius fluminis sub observatione naturam, sive ut Nilus aestivo incremento tumet, etc.*

The phrase *sub observatione* has always excited suspicion. Friedlaender, author of the *Sittengeschichte Roms*, sought to replace it by *rariorem*, and Beltrami (I) made of it the not unattractive *subobscuram rationi*. Part of the suspicion arises, I am sure, from the exceedingly modern sound and appearance of

<sup>3</sup> Georg Windhaus, *Varietas Lectionis . . . e Codice Bambergensi enotata* (Darmstadt, 1879), p. 26, note 9. Windhaus' collation of B, with his shrewd footnotes, is a most valuable piece of work for the text of *Epistles* 89-124. Apparently Axelson is unfamiliar with it; see his *Neuesenecastudien*, note to page 205.

the phrase, with attendant doubt as to whether *observatio* can be justified in Seneca with the sense apparently here required, viz. direct physical inspection of nature or some natural object with resulting conclusions. Yet I think that its use in the phrase *diurna observatione siderum* in Cicero, *De Divinatione*, I, 1, 2, establishes the certainty that it can.

Then there has been the question of finding an adjective to accompany *naturam*. Hense thinks<sup>4</sup> that there should be one because (1) there is one in the preceding portion of the sentence for each of the several nouns, (2) one would expect an adjective like *rariorem* since only rivers of marked peculiarity are named. But (1) *notitiam* at the beginning of the previous sentence has no adjective, (2) the mention of the peculiarities of the rivers through successive *sive* clauses seems to me to *obviate* the necessity of an adjective.

Finally a verb appears definitely to be required as *ostendet*'s influence can hardly extend as far as *naturam*. The fact that *ponere* uses *sub* with the ablative to express the goal of its movement makes that verb seem at once desirable; if inserted after *observatione* it has some formal paleographic justification and furnishes a good clausula (cretic plus spondee plus spondee). As for the meaning, one has heard by report or learned through study of the peculiar nature of certain rivers; now travel will place that nature under watchful study. C. Busche's *sistet* after *naturam* is paleographically and rhythmically good,<sup>5</sup> but *ponere sub* with the ablative seems preferable to me for the syntactical reason already mentioned, and the same may be said of the Beltrami (II) reading *sub<det> observationi*.

CIV, 27 (503, 1): si tamen exemplum desideratis, accipite  
 Socraten, perpessicum senem, per omnia aspera iactatum,  
 invictum tamen et paupertate, quam graviorem  
 illi domestica onera faciebant, et laboribus, quos militares  
 quoque pertulit. quibus ille domi exercitus < est >,  
 sive uxorem eius *reminiscimur* moribus feram, lingua  
 petulantem, sive liberos indociles et matri quam patri  
 similiores. si vere *reputes*, aut in bello fuit aut in  
 tyrannide aut in libertate bellis ac tyrannis saeviore.

<sup>4</sup> *Hermes*, LXII (1927), pp. 112-3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ph. Wochenschrift*, XLV (1925), p. 572.

E. P. Barker<sup>6</sup> refers to this paragraph as a *locus paene clamatus*; he has added his share to the large amount of emendation which has been attempted by many hands. The italicized words above are suggestions of Hense.

I think it practically certain that *quibus ille domi exercitus* belongs with the first sentence of the section, not with the second. The structure of the latter part of the first sentence as I see it is *invictum paupertate quam . . . faciebat* (ablative plus explanatory relative clause) and *laboribus quibus . . . exercitus* (same arrangement). In this second ablative plus its explanatory relative clause there is, however, inserted, quasi-parenthetically, *quos militares quoque pertulit*; the translation is: "unconquered by the hardships with which he was tried at home (and he endured some military ones as well)." The humor of comparing his domestic battles with Xanthippe to his battles while serving in the army is an ancient and honorable jest. Also, when we take *quibus . . . exercitus* with *laboribus* we have a perfect parallel to the *domestica onera* of the earlier relative clause. Hense suggests (crit. not. *ad loc.*) *ille ē* (i. e. *est*), and, while *est* may not be necessary,<sup>7</sup> its addition produces the favorite double-cretic clausula rhythm. It appears then that the coupling of *quibus ille domi exercitus* with what precedes makes excellent sense, while with the small addition of the *ē* suggested by Hense after *ille* it provides an appropriate sentence-termination.

The second sentence then begins with a *sive*, and I agree with Kronenberg<sup>8</sup> that we have here three parallel *sive* clauses, of which the first deals with Xanthippe, the second with the disappointing children, while the third is incomplete through a gap in the MS tradition, but obviously, in view of the main sentence following, dealt with the politics, internal and external, of Athens during Socrates' whole adult life. With Kronenberg I hold (and the idea had occurred to me independently) that the *re* in the MS *sivere* is for *rē*; in the gap the next word must have been *publicam*, followed by something like this: <*et bellis diu et tyrannis vehementer vexatam*>. We then require a verb to govern the objects *uxorem, liberos, rem publicam* in our three successive *sive* clauses, and *consideraveris* or *reputaveris* would

<sup>6</sup> E. P. Barker, *Seneca's Letters to Lucilius* (Oxford, 1932), II, p. 331.

<sup>7</sup> L. Castiglioni, *Gnomon*, III (1927), p. 669.

<sup>8</sup> A. J. Kronenberg, *C. Q.*, XVII (1923), pp. 43-4.

serve, or *speces* or *reminiscaris*; this can only be speculative. With this reconstructed triple condition the main sentence agrees in every detail.

CIV, 29 (503, 25) : tota illi (*sc.* Catoni) aetas aut in armis est exacta civilibus aut † intacta concipiente iam civile bellum.

Q has *intanta*; BA as above. There have been many attempts at emendation, all based on the idea that some appropriate noun is concealed in *tacta*. The drift of the thought suggests that Cato's life-years are divided between two periods in the history of the Republic, one when civil war had actually broken out, the other when, though the forms of the Republic were in a sense preserved, civil war was in the air. Now in connection with this latter we have definitely the word *concipiente*, which may mean "conceiving." That in turn may at least suggest that *tacta* means, as in the common language of Rome, "seduced." We have then to discover a noun to which these two epithets could be properly applied in a figurative sense, and as a matter of fact the rather obvious *res publica* occurs in Harleianus 2659 in the form *R. P.*, which Rossbach holds to be correct.<sup>9</sup> I suspect that there was some point in the manuscript tradition where *in R. P. tacta* was so written that it was possible for one scribe to miss the *R. P.* and for another in his interest over having found *R. P.* to forget to include the *tacta*; such a place would be at the end of a line with *in tacta* written in the line and *R. P.* above it. The one copyist would write what was in the line and miss the *R. P.* while the other, having noticed the *R. P.* got it into the line but omitted to complete the line with *tacta*. I suggest therefore *aut in < R. P. > tacta, concipiente iam civile bellum*. This I translate: "or in a violated commonwealth already shaping civil war in its womb."

WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

<sup>9</sup> *Ph. Wochenschrift*, XXXIV (1914), p. 496.

## THE SOURCES OF VERGIL, *AENEID*, III, 692-705.

Sicanio praetenta sinu iacet insula contra  
Plemurium undosum; nomen dixere priores  
Ortygiam. Alpheum fama est huc Elidis amnem  
occultas egisse vias subter mare, qui nunc  
ore, Arethusa, tuo Siculis confunditur undis.  
iussi numina magna loci veneramur; at inde  
exsupero praepingue solum stagnantis Helori:  
hinc altas cautes projectaque saxa Pachyni  
radimus, et fatis nunquam concessa moveri  
apparet Camarina procul, campique Geloi,  
immanisque Gela fluvii cognomine dicta.  
arduuus inde Acragas ostentat maxima longe  
moenia, magnanimum quondam generator equorum.

(Vergil, *Aeneid*, III, 692-705.)

In this passage Aeneas recounts his voyage along the east and the southwest coasts of Sicily. No important episode occurred here, and, to fill out the narrative, Vergil appends to each place-name a few words of description. Servius and modern editors note that some of these allusions are dramatically inappropriate, for Aeneas is represented as mentioning towns which were not supposed to have been founded in his day, and even calls attention to some special features of these later settlements which remained as yet in the future. Conington's comment expresses a reasonable judgement on this peculiarity: "A poet with his mind full of the literary and historical interest of his subject is perhaps not unlikely to allow the expression of that feeling to escape him even at the most inappropriate time." But it is possible to suggest that the material underlying Vergil's allusions was somewhat more specific than the general "literary and historical" interest of Sicily. Commentators do not appear to have observed that three oracles current in the ancient world each find an echo in Vergil's description.

(1) Pausanias (V, 7, 3) quotes the beginning of a Delphic response said to have been given to Archias, the founder of Syracuse:

Ὀρτυγίη τις κεῖται ἐν ἡεροειδεῖ πόντῳ,  
Θρινακίης καθύπερθεν, ἵν' Ἀλφειοῦ στόμα βλύζει  
μισγόμενον πηγαῖσιν ἔπρεπτης Ἀρεθούσης.

This corresponds closely in sense to the first five lines of the passage which we have quoted, especially if we suppose that

Vergil was paraphrasing the difficult Θριακίης καθύπερθε by Sicanio praetenta sinu.

(2) Servius on line 701 tells the anecdote about the oracle which forbade Camarina to be disturbed. It is also preserved in a slightly different form in *Anthologia Graeca*, IX, 685. No one can doubt in this instance that Vergil is referring to the traditional prophecy.

(3) There are two different oracles extant on the foundation of Gela. The more familiar one derives the town's name from a pun on the Greek verb γελᾶν. But Diodorus Siculus (VIII, 23) recorded an entirely different response of the Pythia, which is probably authentic:

Ἐντιμ' ἡδὲ Κράτωνος ἀγακλέος νιὲ δαΐφρον,  
ἐλθόντες Σικελὴν <καλὴν> χθόνα ναίετον ἄμφω,  
δειμάμενοι πτολίεθρον ὅμοι Κρητῶν 'Ροδίων τε  
πὰρ προχοὰς ποταμοῖο Γέλα συνομάνυμον ἀγνοῦ.

Here the one specific detail about the town—that it was to derive its name from the neighbouring river—reappears in Vergil's description.

(4) Finally, one may note that Servius on line 704, after mentioning Pindar as an authority for the victories of Agrigentine horses in Greek games, adds: *Legimus etiam aliud: cum in Cappadocia greges equorum perissent, Delphici Apollinis responso adduxerunt equos de Agrigento et reparavere meliores.* This appears to be the only mention of this oracular response, and Servius does not give any chronological datum. The chief literary allusions to the Cappadocian horse as a famous breed come from the third or fourth century A. D. (Steier, *R.-E.*, s. v. "Pferd"). Vergil's reference to the famous steeds of Acragas does not require to be explained as alluding to this utterance of the Pythia. But, in view of the oracles which we have already cited, it is at least worth notice that Servius thought to find a possible reference here also to an oracle.

These three examples of prophecies echoed in Vergil would not, perhaps, be very convincing, if taken separately. But three instances in eleven lines lend each other some mutual support. May one offer as the explanation this hypothesis? Vergil needed to find matter to fill out this otherwise uneventful stretch of Aeneas' voyage. For the purpose he went to some author, probably Greek, who recorded the foundations of Sicilian cities

with their local oracles. This gave Vergil some material with which to decorate his narrative, and he chose particularly to paraphrase the oracular responses recorded by his authority. The reason may have been partly that they were already in verse, but also that as prophecies they could with rather less inappropriateness be put into the mouth of Aeneas, even before the foundation of Syracuse, Camarina, or Gela.

H. W. PARKE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

#### NOTE ON HERACLITUS, FRAGMENT 124.

All the manuscripts of Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* in which this fragment is found give the following reading: ἀλογον δὲ κάκείνοις δόξειν ἂν εἰ ὁ μὲν ὅλος οὐρανὸς καὶ ἔκαστα τῶν μερῶν ἄπαντ' ἐν τάξει καὶ λόγῳ καὶ μορφῇς καὶ δυνάμεσιν καὶ περιόδοις ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς μηθὲν τοιοῦτον ἀλλ' ὥσπερ σάρξ εἰκῆ κεχυμένων ὁ κάλλιστος φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος ὁ κόσμος.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, this reading is upheld by Bartholomaeus of Messina with the exception that he apparently read *εἰ* for *εἰκῆ*, translating the last clause: "Sed quemadmodum caro si confusorum pulcherimus ait heraclitus mundus."<sup>2</sup>

The perplexity that this passage has caused modern scholars may be seen from the number and diversity of the emendations. Bergk changed *κάκείνοις* to *κάκαιο*. Diels emended *σάρξ* to *σάρμα*, Bernays to *σάρον*, and Usener to *σωρός*. The last suggested *κεχυμένων* for *κεχυμένων*. The *ὁ* before *κόσμος* was excised by Wimmer. In the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* and the Ross-Fobes edition of Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* the text of the quotation is: "ὥσπερ σάρμα εἰκῆ κεχυμένων ὁ κάλλιστος," φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος, " [ό] κόσμος."<sup>3</sup>

It would be tedious and perhaps not helpful to repeat all the current interpretations that are based on these changes, but two of the more recent may serve to indicate the general trend. Ross and Fobes render as follows: "The most fair universe," as

<sup>1</sup>7 a 10-15. The only variation in the manuscripts is that Σ has ἄπαντά τ' for ἄπαντ'.

<sup>2</sup>W. Kley, *Theophrasts Metaphysisches Bruchstück und die Schrift περὶ σημείων in der lateinischen Übersetzung des Bartholomaeus von Messina*.

<sup>3</sup>Diels-Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 5th ed., I, p. 178, 10-15; *Theophrastus Metaphysics*, ed. W. D. Ross and F. H. Fobes (Oxford, 1929).

Heraclitus says, "is like a rubbish heap of things thrown together anyhow." And Fränkel, using the same text: "The most perfectly organized universe is like a heap of garbage dumped at random (*scil.* when compared to the less obvious organization behind and beyond the manifest regularity of sun, stars, and life)."<sup>4</sup>

An examination of the context will prove, however, that the manuscript readings must be kept. In the immediately preceding part Theophrastus has raised the question whether the principles should be shapeless and as it were potential, or possessed of shape like those of Plato in the *Timaeus*. Some thinkers, he says, maintain that all the ruling principles are possessed of form; others posit material principles only; a third group adopts both kinds of principles on the assumption that complete reality is dependent upon both since being as a whole is composed of contraries.<sup>5</sup> The members of this division are respectively Plato and the Pythagoreans, the majority of the Presocratics, and the Peripatetics.<sup>6</sup>

It is in the criticism of the second group that the fragment under discussion appears. The objection that Theophrastus raises is that urged by Aristotle against the Atomists in particular:<sup>7</sup> the materialists had characterized the phenomenal world by order and at the same time denied any similar order to the first principles. Theophrastus' motive for quoting Heraclitus is to wrest from his own words an admission of an antithesis between the orderli-

<sup>4</sup> H. Fränkel, "A Thought Pattern in Heraclitus," *A. J. P.*, LIX (1938), pp. 319-320.

<sup>5</sup> Theophrastus, *Metaphysics* 6 b 23 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 7 a 6-10. Of the first class Theophrastus mentions only Plato, but from the continual association of Plato and the Pythagoreans it is safe to assume that they are meant here too. The Atomists might be included in this group but Empedocles, although his principles were in a sense definite, would be placed in the second group. Earlier (6 b 25-26) Theophrastus gives as an example of the second class those who made fire and earth principles. He probably is not thinking of particular philosophers but is using fire and earth merely as symbols of all the early physical doctrines (see Ross-Fobes *ad loc.* and Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 987 A 17). The loose writing of Theophrastus here obscures the meaning, since for the Peripatetics form and matter are not opposites (see Aristotle, *Physics*, A, chap. 9).

<sup>7</sup> See Aristotle, *Physics* 196 A 24-B 5 (cf. Simplicius, *Phys.*, p. 331, 16 ff.) and *De Part. Animal.* 641 B 15-23.

ness of the world of perception and the disorder of the principles from which the world is formed. Certainly Theophrastus is doing violence to Heraclitus' theory, for whatever the *κεχυμένα* were they were not principles in an Aristotelian sense; but, although these considerations may throw suspicion on Theophrastus' understanding of the fragment, they do at least clarify the function of the quotation in the argument and make the manuscript readings intelligible. The translation must be: "But even those who posit material principles must (i. e. if they considered the matter rightly) think it unreasonable if, while the whole heaven and each of its parts are in order and plan in respect of shapes, powers, and periods of time, in the ruling principles nothing of the sort is present, but as Heraclitus says 'the fairest man is flesh composed of parts scattered at random' so is the cosmos."

Since *ῶσπερ* must be taken with *φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος*<sup>8</sup> the actual quotation is: *σάρξ εἰκῇ κεχυμένων ὁ κάλλιστος*. The context may lead one to suspect that Heraclitus had in some way connected *ὁ κάλλιστος* and *ὁ κόσμος*, and that Theophrastus is quoting directly only part of one of Heraclitus' sayings framed in the familiar AB : BC thought pattern.<sup>9</sup> The original could possibly have run: "The fairest man is flesh composed of parts scattered at random; men are but scattered parts of the cosmos."

JOHN B. McDIARMID.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

#### A NOTE ON THE LOCATION OF THE *CENA TRIMALCHIONIS*.

The problem of where the *Cena Trimalchionis* took place has provided material for a great deal of learned discussion.<sup>1</sup> Evi-

<sup>8</sup> Ross-Fobes' interpretation requires that *ῶσπερ* be taken with both *σάρμα* and *φησὶν*. This impossible construction, which is implied by most of the current interpretations, is obviated by the observation that *ῶσπερ . . . φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος* go together and enclose the quotation and that this whole phrase is predicate to *ὁ κόσμος*.

<sup>9</sup> E. g. frags. 79, 82, 83. Cf. Fränkel, *loc. cit.*

<sup>1</sup> For the literature on the subject see Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*<sup>4</sup>, II, p. 512. Cumae, Tarracina, Naples, Puteoli, and Misenum have all been suggested. At present Cumae appears to be the favorite.

dence has been adduced from the few geographical data given by the text and from the details of local administration which may be gleaned from the conversation of the guests. Always supposing that Petronius laid this scene in a real town, as he did the others in the *Satyricon*, there is one more piece of evidence which, as far as I know, has never been utilized, and suggests a new possibility.

In an effort to describe the elegance of his house Trimalchio tells us that when Scaurus—whatever he may have been—came to town he preferred to stay with him—Trimalchio—rather than go to his own place by the sea. *ad summam, Scaurus cum huc venit, nusquam mavoluit hospitari, et habet ad mare paternum hospitium.*<sup>2</sup>

The name of a Scaurus is preserved today in Scauri, a village about three miles up the coast from the ancient Minturnae.<sup>3</sup> The environs of Scauri, although not the modern village itself, abound in the remains of ancient buildings, some of which might well have belonged to a Roman villa. It is probable that the name of Scauri has never been changed, unlike so many Italian towns which have of recent years shifted back from their mediaeval to their classical names.

On the basis of this evidence I should like to suggest that the *Cena* took place at Minturnae. This possibility certainly satisfies the geographical requirements made in chap. 81 (*locumque secretum et proximum litoris maestus conduxi*), since Minturnae was a well-known seaport. Another statement in chap. 81 (*exul in deversorio Graecae urbis iacerem desertus*) has been interpreted to refer to a city with more Greek character than Minturnae, on the edge of Campania, could lay claim to. It does not, however, seem necessary to apply the phrase "Graeca urbs" to the whole city. It may well have meant the Greek quarter, as we say "Chinatown" or "Little Italy."<sup>4</sup> In a seaport the Greek quarter would very probably be on the waterfront,

<sup>2</sup> *Satyricon*, 77.

<sup>3</sup> A. De Santis, *Orme di Roma nella Toponomastica della Regione Gaetana* (in *Atti del IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Istituto di Studi Romani, 1938), p. 5; J. Johnson, *Excavations at Minturnae*, II: *Inscriptions*, Part I: *Republican Magistri* (Roma-Philadelphia, 1933), p. 67.

<sup>4</sup> This interpretation of the phrase was suggested to me by Prof. Lily Ross Taylor.

and, if that locality had anything of the reputation in ancient cities that it has in modern ones, we can understand how the phrase would add to the picture of Encolpius' unpleasant situation. Otherwise the phrase has little point, for certainly he was perfectly at home in a real Greek city such as Croton. There is little in the *Cena* to suggest that Trimalchio's city was any more thoroughly Greek than, for instance, Pompeii.

The slenderness of this evidence prevents Minturnae from being anything more than another possible candidate for the honor of sheltering Trimalchio. The more the merrier, however, and further evidence may someday raise the number of claimants to equality with the rival birth-places of Homer.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

AGNES KIRSOPP LAKE.

#### THE DATE OF THE AUGUSTUS FROM PRIMA PORTA.

It had been assumed for a long time that the famous statue of Augustus which was found in Livia's villa at Prima Porta in 1863 could be dated within a short limit of years. The representation on the cuirass, namely the returning of the Roman eagles by the Parthians in 20 B. C., is the *terminus post quem*, and it is the most likely assumption that this diplomatic triumph was the very cause for the erection of the statue. A date 19 B. C., or soon after, is thus the date upheld by many scholars.<sup>1</sup> Corroborative evidence is found on Roman coins which commemorate the same event from the years 20 to 15 B. C.<sup>2</sup> The head fits this date very well, because Augustus seems to be represented in his forties or early fifties; he was born in 63 B. C.

But there are arguments which militate against this early date. It has been maintained that the statue must have been

<sup>1</sup> W. Amelung, *D. Skulpturen d. Vatikan. Museums* (Berlin, 1903), I, pp. 19 ff.: after 13 B. C.; W. Helbig, *Führer d. d. Sammlungen in Rom*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1912), I, pp. 4 ff.: etwa 18 B.C. A few of the latest references: Weikert, *Die Antike*, XIV (1938), pp. 220 f.: about 19 B. C.; Matz, *Die Welt als Geschichte*, IV (1938), p. 218: about 18 B. C.; Poulsen, *Danske Vid. Selskab, Arch.-kunsthist. Meddelelser*, II, No. 5 (1939), p. 25: 20-18 B. C.

<sup>2</sup> Hohl, *Klio*, XXXI (1938), p. 269; H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, I (London, 1923), pp. ciii ff.

made after Augustus' death, because he is barefoot, a feature which proves heroization.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, most of the Roman statues with a cuirass wear boots, and the counterargument that Greek and Early Italic warriors are barefoot does not hold good for the Augustus.<sup>4</sup> The little Cupid by his side is usually taken merely as an allusion to the divine descent of Augustus from Venus,<sup>5</sup> but its meaning seems to be far more important. Studniczka recognized its head as a portrait and saw in him the son of Julia and Agrippa, namely Gaius who was born in 20 B. C. and thus was about two years of age at the presumable date of the statue in 18 B. C.<sup>6</sup> Hohl in a recent article maintains, on the other hand, that no living boy could have been represented as Cupid because cupids were taken by the Romans as symbols of the souls of deceased children. The superstitious Augustus would have seen in such representation an *omen maturi exitus*.<sup>7</sup> There is ample evidence for this Roman belief on sepulchral monuments such as ash-urns, sarcophagi, and tombstones.<sup>8</sup> The dolphin is found on monuments of the same category and must likewise be taken as a symbol of the nether world.<sup>9</sup> Also for their combination, namely a cupid riding on a dolphin, a symbolical meaning is assumed by a number of scholars.<sup>10</sup> Hohl refers to a passage in Suetonius, *Caligula*, 7, which gives the final proof for the interpretation of the cupid of the statue: *duo infantes*, namely of Germanicus and Agrippina, *adhuc rapti*,

<sup>3</sup> Picard, *Rev. Hist. Rel.*, CXIV (1936), p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> Maucini, *Bull. Com.*, L (1923), pp. 151 ff.; Hekler, *Oest. Jh.*, XIX/XX (1919), pp. 190 ff.

<sup>5</sup> E. Strong, *C. A. H. Plates*, IV, p. 148; Rodenwaldt, *Die Antike*, XIII (1917), p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Röm. Mitt.*, XXV (1910), pp. 27 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Klio*, XXXI (1938), pp. 269 ff.

<sup>8</sup> W. Altmann, *D. römischen Grabaltäre d. Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1905), pp. 257 ff.; Cumont, *Syria*, X (1929), pp. 288 ff.; Schröder, *Bonn. Jahrb.*, CVIII (1902), p. 65; E. Strong, *Apotheosis and After Life* (London, 1915), p. 173 and *Scultura Romana* (Firenze, 1923), p. 62; E. Stebbins, *The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome* (Menasha, 1929), pp. 81 f.; Eitrem, *Symb. Osl.*, XI (1932), pp. 29 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Altmann, *op. cit.*, p. 274; Strong, *Apotheosis*, pp. 229 f.

<sup>10</sup> M. Maximova, *Les Vases Plastiques dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1927), I, p. 29; R. Eisler, *Orphisch-Dionysische Mysterien-Gedanken* (*Vorträge Bibl. Warburg*, II [1922/3]), pp. 113 f.; but cf. Stebbins, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 f., 118.

*unus iam puerascens insigni festivitate, cuius effigiem habitu Cupidinis in aede Capitolinae Veneris Livia dedicavit. . . .* The cupid must thus represent the elder brother of Caligula, likewise named Gaius, who died in 12 A. D. Consequently, the statue from Prima Porta cannot be earlier than 12 A. D.

A third argument for a late date is the style. Mrs. Strong favors a date as late as the time of Claudius; she adds as a fourth argument that the vision of empire as represented on the breast-plate is impossible for the time of 19 B. C.<sup>11</sup> The author also came to the conclusion that the style is incompatible with a dating before our era, when he compared the statue with the frieze of the Ara Pacis set side by side in the exhibition of Augustan art at the Metropolitan Museum in 1939. A few words must suffice, because the final proof must be based on a new study of the development of Augustan art. The monuments of the two last decades B. C., best represented by the heads of Agrippa who died in 12 B. C. and the reliefs of the Ara Pacis which were made between 13 and 9 B. C., differ from the works belonging to the beginning of the first century A. D. exemplified by portraits of the elderly Augustus, that from the Via Labicana and those in Chiusi and Ancona.<sup>12</sup> The later style represents the climax of the neo-classic tendency of Augustan art; the examples are extremely cool and calm; they are highly refined, but show some lack of vigor. The earlier works have not reached the neoclassic climax and show greater animation and freshness; the forms are fuller and rounder; they look more organic and less abstract especially than the head of the Prima Porta figure.

But is it likely that the success over the Parthians would have been represented more than thirty years after the event? Hohl's assumption that the cuirass of the statue is the reproduction of an actual one ordered by Augustus in 20 B. C. is clearly proffered only for want of a better explanation (eine Verlegenheitshypothese). Such a better explanation is afforded by a theory of Loeschcke published in 1906 which has not found the attention it deserves.<sup>13</sup> He assumes that the statue of Prima Porta is the

<sup>11</sup> *C. A. H. Plates*, IV, p. 148.

<sup>12</sup> Curtius, *Röm. Mitt.*, XLVIII (1933), pp. 215 ff., pls. 30-33, 37; Strong, *Sculptura*, pp. 25 ff., 237, pls. 7 f., 72; Levi, *Boll. d'Arte*, ser. 3, XXVIII (1934), pp. 408 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Bonn. Jahrb.*, CXIV/CXV (1906), p. 470. Woelcke, *ibid.*, CXX

copy in marble of an original in bronze. His proof is based on the unfinished condition of the back where we see a trophy and above it one single wing of a Victory, the Victory having never been executed. It is evident that the omission of the Victory is due to the fact that the statue was supposed to be set against a wall so that the back could not be seen. Would any artist having such an order, however, first conceive a motive which was not necessary, then, because it was not visible later, execute only half of it? It is much more likely that a copyist continued his careful copying from the front to the back and then stopped halfway when he realized that his work was unnecessary.

Loeschcke's theory thus solves all the difficulties raised by the conflicting arguments: a bronze statue was set up by Augustus soon after 20 B. C. to celebrate his diplomatic success over the Parthians. Shortly after his death in 14 A. D. Livia ordered a copy for her villa at Prima Porta. Since the copy was of marble, a support was necessary, for which was chosen the motive of the great-grandson, Gaius, of whom both Livia and Augustus had been very fond and who had died a few years earlier. The features of the head of Augustus showing him in his forties were naturally retained in the copy but rendered in the new style of the later period.

VALENTIN MÜLLER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

#### A NEW SOURCE ON THE SPARTAN EPHEBIA.

One of the chief sources for the Spartan *ephebia* is a gloss on Herodotus: <sup>1</sup> εἰρήν· παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ὁ παῖς ρωβίδας καλεῖται, τῷ δευτέρῳ προκομζόμενος, τῷ τρίτῳ μικιζόμενος, τῷ τετάρτῳ πρόπαις, τῷ πέμπτῳ παῖς, τῷ ἕκτῳ μελείρην. ἐφηβεύει δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ ἑτῶν δεκατεσσάρων μέχρι εἴκοσιν. βαρυτόνως δὲ τὸ μελείρην, ὥσπερ πυθμὴν ἀπύθμην, αὐχὴν ὑψαύχην. This gloss is found

(1911), pp. 180 f. uses it wrongly by assuming a pre-Augustan original. The objections in Helbig, *Führer*, p. 7 are not valid.

<sup>1</sup> H. Stein, edition of Herodotus, II (1871), 465 (cf. 475). The gloss was probably intended to explain the word *Ιρέες* in Herodotus, IX, 85, which has been emended to *εἰρέες*. But see Busolt-Swoboda, *Griech. Staatskunde*, II (1926), p. 696, n. 3 *ad fin.*

in an alphabetical lexicon preserved in several MSS of the 14th and later centuries; but the lexicon is simply an alphabetization of the glosses *ad verbum* found in a Coislin MS of the 10th century, although the end of the glossary, containing our gloss, is lost in this MS. Stein suggests that the source of this gloss was Aristophanes Byzantius, *περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικῶν*. In view of its last sentence and the new quotation (below), it is probable that an intermediate source was Herodian, *περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας*, a work widely used in the Byzantine period.

An unexpected source has provided a new quotation of this gloss which changes its meaning and suggests other conclusions than those currently drawn from it on the subject of the Spartan *ephebia*. In the oldest manuscript of Strabo's *Geography*, Paris 1397 of the 10th century, later hands of the 14th or 15th century have copied into the margins a quantity of extraneous material. Much of it is lexicographical, and on fol. 225v-226r we find the following article: *τὰ εἰς ἣν λήγοντα σύνθετα, ὅτε ἀπὸ ῥητῶν τουτέστιν ἴδια λεγομένων τῶν εἰς ἣν ἔστι, βαρύνεται· ῥὴν πολύρρην· Ἑλλην φιλέλλην· πυθμὴν ἀπύθμην· αὐχῆν ἐριαύχην καὶ βυσσαύχην, ὁ τὸν αὐχένα συστέλλων εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς ὄμοις ἀνέχων· εἰρήνη μελλείρην, παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ὁ μέλλων εἰρήνη ἔσεσθαι. ἐφηβεύει μὲν γὰρ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ὁ παῖς ἐπ' ἑτῶν ἵδη μέχρι καλεῖται δὲ τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ῥωβίδας, τῷ δὲ δευτέρῳ προκομιζόμενος, τῷ τρίτῳ μικιζόμενος, τῷ δὲ πρόπταις, τῷ ἐπαῖς, τῷ δὲ μελλείρην, τῷ ζειρήν.*

It will be observed that both sources make the Spartan *ephebia* last "from 14 years to 20" and give the names of seven year-classes. But the old source makes the *ephebia* follow these year-classes, while the new source makes it consist of them. The old quotation has been variously interpreted. Some have understood *ῥωβίδας* to be an infant in his first year, *μικιζόμενος* a child in his third year, etc.<sup>2</sup> Others, applying a statement of Plutarch (*Lycurgus*, 16, 4) that Spartan boys were enrolled in companies at the age of seven, understand *μικιζόμενος* as a boy in his 10th year, *ειρήνη* as a youth in his fourteenth. This is now the prevailing view.<sup>3</sup> Still others have claimed that the *ειρένες* were

<sup>2</sup> This is the sense in which some of these terms are defined in Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, even in the new ninth edition by Jones and McKenzie.

<sup>3</sup> Woodward, *Annual of the Brit. Sch. at Athens*, XV (1908-9), pp. 45-8; Nilsson, "Die Grundlagen des Spartanischen Lebens," *Klio*, XII

young men over 20,<sup>4</sup> applying another statement of Plutarch (*Lycurgus*, 17, 2) : εἰρένας δὲ καλοῦσι τὸν ἔτος ἥδη δεύτερον ἐκ παιδῶν γεγονότας, μελλείρενας δὲ τῶν παιδῶν τὸν πρεσβυτάτους. οὗτος οὖν ὁ εἰρήνη, εἴκοσι ἔτη γεγονός, ἄρχει κτλ. This seems to harmonize with the new quotation, according to which the ῥωβίδας would be a boy in the first year of ephebic training, 13 or 14 years old, the μικιζόμενος would be 15 or 16, the παιᾶς 17 or 18, the εἰρήνη 19 or 20. There is of course ambiguity in the numbers because "18 years old" and "19th year of age" are equivalent expressions; but probably the boy entered the *ephebia* at the age of 13, the first year being the 14th of his age, and the fifth the 18th of his age. A Greek attained majority (ἐκ παιδῶν, εἰς ἄνδρας) at 18 years.<sup>5</sup> According to this interpretation, in the last year before majority he would be called *παιᾶς*. Plutarch's remark about μελλείρενες must be inaccurate, since they would already be ἐκ παιδῶν. Moreover the εἰρένες themselves would not be 20 years old, but only in their 20th year, that is, 19 years old.

It is still problematical whether the new quotation of the article on *εἰρήνη* is authentic and the interpretation it suggests valid for the Spartan *ephebia*. Plutarch explicitly mentions pre-ephebic training beginning at seven and continuing at twelve. Xenophon (*Lac. Resp.*, 3, 1; 4, 1; 5, 1) vaguely recognizes three stages of Spartan training, παιδεῖς, μειράκια, ἡβῶντες, which may coincide somehow with the stages at seven, twelve, fourteen, and eighteen mentioned elsewhere. The Spartan athletic inscriptions of the Roman period, which mention μικιζόμενοι and other year-classes, do not indicate their age.

AUBREY DILLER.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

(1912), pp. 309-11; Kolbe, *Inscriptiones Graecae*, V, 1 (1913), p. 79; Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.*, pp. 695-7.

<sup>4</sup> G. Gilbert, *Handbuch der Griech. Staatsalterthümer*, I (1893), p. 70.

<sup>5</sup> Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 696, n. 3.

## REVIEWS.

H. G. EVELYN WHITE and JAMES H. OLIVER. *The Temple of Hibis in El Khārgeh Oasis. Part II, Greek Inscriptions.* (*Publications of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition*, Vol. XIV.) New York, 1938. Pp. xiii + 71; pls. XIII.

This tall, slender volume, with the attractive format and typography that the Metropolitan Museum of Art habitually provides for its publications, will receive high praise from reviewers for the aid which it lends to historiography, but its unusual merit as an achievement in epigraphy may be overlooked. This would be a pity, because men like Professor Oliver work with full consciousness of purpose toward the perfection of their methods of deciphering ancient documents and of communicating their results to others. This concentration on methodology is peculiarly appropriate to an editor of texts, since the validity of a reading and hence of the historical inferences derived from it frequently depends on the rigor of the palaeographic or epigraphic technique by which it has been obtained and the stringency of the critical procedure by which it has been tested. In the present volume Professor Oliver has sought by every reasonable means to safeguard the student against being victimized by the errors of all the editors who have ever worked on the great inscriptions included in his publication; and, in order to increase the resources of those who will approach his own edition critically, he has provided remarkably clear photographs of the more important texts.

The book has a long history, which has been briefly recounted in the preface by H. E. Winlock. The original manuscript was prepared by Evelyn White in the years 1909 to 1913, when he had considerable opportunity to study the Greek inscriptions of the Temple of Amūn at Hibis in the Southern or Great Oasis of El Khārgeh under the auspices of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. His attention was subsequently occupied elsewhere, and when he died in 1924 his manuscript was not ready for the printer. The delicate and arduous task of putting it into final shape was later assumed by Oliver. The principles that guided his work as a reviser are described in his own words in Winlock's preface. So far as he was able, Oliver has left Evelyn White's manuscript intact, but, by adding lavishly from his own critical resources such notes of discussion, amplification, and correction as he deemed necessary, he has effected as satisfactory a collaboration as the living can make with the dead. Oliver has placed almost all his own remarks in angular brackets. At times one wonders whether he might not have done better to rework his final manuscript into a coherent whole with no demarcation of the contributions of the two editors. The book would have profited from this fusion of its parts especially where it is clear that Evelyn White was not sufficiently well informed. On the other hand, the book in its present arrangement breathes a strong spirit of *pietas* toward a distinguished predecessor, and for the spectator there is genuine pleasure in witnessing the homage offered by one scholar to the literary legacy of another.

The volume derives its importance from the new and improved

texts which it makes available of the well known edicts of Gnaeus Vergilius Capito and Tiberius Julius Alexander on abuses in the financial, legal, and military administration. Of the inscription containing the edict of Capito (No. 1; A. D. 49) two full columns are preserved, but Cols. III and IV leave much to be desired. With his usual care Oliver gives a diplomatic transcript of Col. III as well as one partially restored *exempli gratia*, as he says. In a "supplementary note" he prints off, side by side, the attempts at restoring both columns made by Evelyn White and Jouguet. They are useful for comparison with his own text.

No. 2 is the very fragmentary *editio princeps* of an edict of Lucius Julius Vestinus (A. D. 60) concerned in some way with boundaries and cattle. Not enough is preserved to fix the meaning. The epigraphical problem is complicated by the extensive damage which the stone has undergone from weather, salt, and irrigation water. Readers may find some interest in comparing the two photographs (Pls. IV and V), the one taken in 1910, the other in 1937, of Col. I.

The editors present under No. 3 a hitherto unpublished, but seriously incomplete copy of the edict of Alexander (A. D. 68). Under other circumstances considerable importance might have been attached to this find, but a complete copy of the edict has long been known to exist at Hibis, and this is published once again as No. 4 with elaborate epigraphical commentary. Evelyn White and Oliver have made great advances in the constitution of the text, and perhaps the excellent photographs included in the volume will enable epigraphers to go still further.<sup>1</sup> Where the problem is one of restoration as distinct from reading, the new text may give an opportunity to scholars in related fields.<sup>2</sup> For the sake of completeness, and doubtless to facilitate comparison, Oliver has introduced a "supplementary note" containing a partial text of the edict as read by Wilcken on a Berlin papyrus, *B. G. U.*, VII, 1563.

The rest of the volume does not have the general importance of the edicts, but an occasional text looks as if it may prove significant for the history of the temple area. The two epigrams (Nos. 5 and 6) devoted to the generosity of Hermeias, who at some time late in the third century A. D. paid for the construction of a pavement of seven hundred cubits,<sup>3</sup> need to be related to the archaeological evi-

<sup>1</sup> Certainly the eye of the non-specialist, or rather of the specialist who is not a trained epigrapher, is unlikely to find the photographs an immediately useful instrument of research. Where the stone is intact, the reading presents almost no difficulty. Where the surface of the stone is not well preserved, the photographs will hardly justify disagreement with the text of Evelyn White and Oliver. On the rôle of the photograph in epigraphy and the assistance which it lends to a qualified student, one may now read Meritt's lecture on "Readings" in his *Epigraphica Attica* (*Martin Classical Lectures*, IX [1940]), especially pp. 20 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In lines 53-54, e. g., Welles (*A. J. A.*, XLIV [1940], p. 265) has suggested  $\dot{\nu}[\pi\sigma\gamma\rho]\phi\eta\varsigma$  in place of  $\dot{\nu}[\pi\sigma\theta\eta\kappa]\eta\varsigma$ . This proposal would find strong support in Egyptian usage, and the photograph lends it a certain amount of justification, but with regard to  $\phi$  I should wish greater assurance than the photograph gives, especially since Evelyn White saw no trace of it on the original and Oliver seems to have followed him on the basis of the photograph.

<sup>3</sup> No. 5 has [ $\acute{\epsilon}$ ]πτάκι τούς ἐκατὸν πήχεις; No. 6, in Oliver's text, ἐκατὸν πήχει[as] ἐπτ[απόρους]. The latter restoration is based on the assumption

dence. The question has been discussed briefly by Oliver and will be treated at greater length, I imagine, in Part I.<sup>4</sup> No. 7 is part of a door lintel on which is preserved the opening lines of a dedication in honor of Ptolemy Philadelphus on the erection of the Ptolemaic girdle wall and its gateways.

In the hypostyle hall N is a group of dipinti (Nos. 35-39) which appear to give the names of the masons responsible for the erection of the Roman piers built to support the broken architraves. Oliver observes that the lettering would admit a date in the second or third century A. D., but I wonder whether No. 37 may not permit a closer approximation of the date when the repairs were made. The first five lines cannot be read, but line 6 has ZKTYB. C. In the last five letters the editors have recognized Τύβι ε, but they seem not to have considered the possibility that the preceding letters are the number of the year. If the 27th year is really in point, the repairs are fixed in A. D. 186/187. In the printed text, however, Z is taller and heavier than the following letters, and perhaps close examination of a photograph would reveal it as the year-sign itself.

The remaining inscriptions, graffiti, and dipinti (Nos. 8-34, 40-42) range in time from the early Ptolemaic to the Coptic period. A large number of these are simply names; a few others take the form of προσκυνήματα. No. 33, a dipinto consisting of the single name Ἀπολλῶ, has been assigned to the earlier Roman period. It would be difficult to find another example of this form of the name before the late Roman period. The earliest instance cited by Preisigke<sup>5</sup> is Byzantine. The earliest date attested by Heuser<sup>6</sup> is the fourth century A. D. Ἀπολλῶ reflects a typical Coptic treatment of a Greek name. If the graffiti is pre-Coptic, Ἀπόλλω[ν] is more likely. If Ἀπολλῶ is correct, a later date would be more appropriate.<sup>7</sup>

tion that the words describe a pavement 100 cubits in length with seven lanes or sections, and this view derives impressive support from three facts: (1) A road of 700 cubits is almost three times the distance from the landing place on the ancient lake to the temple, and it has proved impossible to find a likely situation for so long a pavement. (2) The epigrams are inscribed on the middle or Great Gateway and the phrase τόδε στρῶμα would indicate that the pavement was laid on the road which led from the lake past the gateway to the temple. (3) The distance from the Great Gateway to the Inner Gateway is somewhat less than 100 cubits, and there may well have been a pavement between them laid down in seven parallel sections, each approximately 100 cubits in length. Nevertheless, No. 5 is non-committal, and Welles' suggestion (*ibid.*) that we read ἐπτ[ατάδοντ] brings No. 6 into perfect accord with it and does not prejudice future discussions of the location of the pavement of "seven times one hundred cubits."

<sup>4</sup> In the preface to Part II Winlock discloses a plan of publication which embraces three parts: I the archaeology, II the Greek inscriptions, III the Egyptian reliefs and the hieroglyphic inscriptions. Only Part II is available at present.

<sup>5</sup> Friedrich Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922), s. v.

<sup>6</sup> Gustav Heuser, *Die Kopten* (Quellen u. Studien z. Gesch. u. Kult. d. Alter. u. d. Mittelalt., II: Prosopographie von Ägypten, IV [Heidelberg, 1938]), s. v.

<sup>7</sup> Wilhelm Pape, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Eigennamen* (Braunschweig, 1911), cites Goar's text of Syncellus 19B (33, 15 ed. D.) in support of Ἀπολλῶ; this is his sole reference for the form. Syncellus is quoting

Each text that has had a previous publication is equipped with a very useful bibliography. A bibliography of a different kind is the concordance of editions placed immediately before the indexes. Perhaps the most splendid feature of the book in its material aspect is the series of thirteen plates which closes the volume. Of special interest to the general reader is the view of the approach to the temple through the Outer Gateway and the Great Gateway (Pl. I) and the closeup of the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander (Pl. VIII). These are unusually attractive photographs for a technical publication and possess a paedagogical value of their own.

HERBERT C. YOUTIE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

---

OLZSCHA, KARL. Interpretation der agramer Mumienbinde. (*Klio*, Beiheft XL, N. F. XXVII.) Leipzig, Dieterich, 1939. Pp. viii + 217. M. 13.

It is an open season again<sup>1</sup> for translating the Etruscan *über linteus*—Runes and Cortsen, Vetter, Theodor Kluge, and now Olzscha, to name no others, are all in full cry. Hunting and trapping offer nothing like so much excitement, or so many surprises. Take for example the words *fler* (-š, -χva, -χve) and *flere* (-š, -ri), the meaning of which is admitted by all the hunters to be “das ‘zentrale’ Problem der Etruskologie,” and which some of the translators take to be different forms of one and the same word, others to be different words: *fler* is “numen” for Sigwart, “statua” for Goldmann, and “oblatio, hostia” for Olzscha, who takes *flere* as “numen, genius” and *flerθrce* as “sacrificeauit.” No wonder if some strange beasts are captured for exhibition in the Etruseological Gardens!

Sensible Etruscologists, therefore, and Olzscha is one of them, refrain from asserting anything like absolute accuracy in their classifications and interpretations. Olzscha’s modesty in this matter inspires confidence. So does the use which he makes of the work of predecessors like Torp, and Herbig, and Danielsson. When Torp was busy with the chase, some forty years ago, most critics found his captures not altogether savage. But if Torp was able to come anywhere near the truth, as was believed then and, by sober scholars at least, for years afterwards and still is, then trackers who take up the investigation anew today naturally are not found encouraging when they begin by denying all that Torp did. The rehabilitation of Torp, then, is one of the happiest features to be detected in Olzscha’s work, but far from being the most important. His own discoveries fit so well with the more satisfying of the many interpretations hitherto proposed, and he is able to accept so many of the best of

Manetho on the first Egyptian dynasty, and it is evident from the context that the god Ἀπόλλων is in question. Dindorf takes Ἀπόλλων to be the true text, and is followed by Waddell in his recent edition of Manetho (Loeb Classical Library, 1940), p. 17. MS A has Ἀπολῶ, but this is significant only for the late spelling of the name.

<sup>1</sup> This review was written in July 1939.

them, either outright or at all events as the starting points for new pursuits, that his present monograph is likely to be recognized in years to come as a valuable contribution towards a final reading of the riddle of the Etruscan sphinx. So far from disappointing the hopes raised by his preliminary papers in *Studi Etruschi* and elsewhere (notably that which appeared in 1936 in *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendlbildung*, XII, pp. 97-116, "Die Sprache der Etrusker, Probleme und neue Wege der Deutung"), it raises new ones. Even if much of the detail in Olzscha's translations of continuous passages of the Agram text has to be modified or abandoned, that is only to be expected; for to translate the document entire now, and when I write translate I mean translate, would be like solving an equation in which ninety percent of the factors are unknowns. But meanwhile, attempts to find meanings for those unknowns, provided always that the method used is sound, lead to partial solutions, and those partial solutions will in time lead to more and more complete solutions, until at last we reach the right answer. It is a procedure which the natural sciences have used with success; and it is because Olzscha uses a sound method—the combinatory method as it has come to be known—and uses it rigorously that his *Interpretation* merits serious consideration.

There is already a certain measure of agreement about Etruscan numerals, which appear at intervals in the Agram text, and also about its liturgical character. Starting from this position, Olzscha states his object in these words: "den Sinn der Ganzen zu erfassen und zu einer sicheren Bestimmung wenigstens mancher Worte und Wendungen zu gelangen." Olzscha assumes, and this is perhaps the weakest part of his argument, that an Etruscan ritual text will show fundamental agreement in its formal and structural contents with Italic ritual texts. If we are to know this now positively to be so, we shall have to know first the essential meaning of the text; if we seek to ascertain its meaning in the first place by comparing a dozen or so recorded Italic prayers, above all the Iguvine Tables (the other eleven quoted by Olzscha, pp. 4-10, are all Latin), then we have no proof of the nature of the Agram document. Olzscha is content to refer to his articles in *Stud. Etr.* (VIII, pp. 267 ff., IX, p. 205, n. 1) for the pertinence of the Iguvine Tables and of the prayers in Cato's *R. R.* He has a strong case, but it cannot yet be called water-tight.

It is, however, clear that the greater part of the text may be divided into what Olzscha calls "strophen"; this term is unfortunate, because we have to do with "sakrale gegliederte Prosa" rather than with stanzas of an exactly corresponding, or even of a regular rhythmical, structure. Perhaps "paragraphs" or "rubrics" would better meet the need. Within each of these rubrics Olzscha finds all or several of the elements of Italic prayers, identified as *invocatio*, *placatio*, *oblatio*, *postulatio*, and *acceptatio*. Apart from the weakness of his initial assumption, which makes the Iguvine Tables, *mutatis mutandis*, virtually a sort of bilingual, several times removed, it may be admitted that he is justified in his conclusion (p. 207): "Wir haben durch diese Interpretation ein wichtiges Dokument für die italische Religionsgeschichte erschlossen." And in any case he has supported his theory with a wealth of careful linguistic argument.

He takes up one by one a number of key-words, and, together with them, a number of the rubrics, examining all the available evidence that can point to the meaning, and criticizing the views of other enquirers. And he ends with a specimen rendering of the Neptune-paragraph that reads plausibly enough.

Incidentally Olzscha sets forth again his views of the grammatical structure of Etruscan. For many years it has been realized that there is no ground for ascribing to the Etruscan language a grammatical category of the type that is understood by the term accusative. In the strongest contrast with Indo-European, there are in Basque and in certain Caucasian dialects passive verbal forms, accompanied by forms of expression in the noun that Schuchardt called active (i. e. as designating the actor, Latin *ab* with the ablative), and that Friedrich calls the "transitive subject." The term ergative also has been suggested and is to be preferred because it has the advantage of avoiding misleading associations with Indo-European categories. Similarly there are objective forms, rather than a nominative case, although of course these may correspond to the grammatical subject (nominative) of a (passive) sentence in Indo-European. Some of the North-American Indian languages have this sort of structure, in greater or less degree. And Olzscha maintains that Etruscan has the same sort of structure. Now it is noteworthy that also Urartäisch (or Chaldisch), which was spoken in the districts between the upper Euphrates and the eastern highlands of Asia Minor, and which, as Olzscha points out, is considered chronologically not far removed from Etruscan, appears to have comparable grammatical features. Are we, then, at last on the track of something with which Etruscan may legitimately be compared? And of something that will throw new light on the proto-Indo-European stratum of languages in the Mediterranean basin? Olzscha thinks that we are. When all allowance is made for the many elements of chance that must enter into the chase, it is evident that Olzscha has started a new trail that promises well. *Macte uirtute.*

J. WHATMOUGH.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

ANDRÉ AYMARD. *Les Assemblées de la Confédération Achaienne.* (*Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi*, Fasc. XXI.) Paris, Boccard, 1938. Pp. xv + 450. Fr. 90.

Les premiers Rapports de Rome et de la Confédération Achaienne, 198-189 avant J.-C. (*Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi*, Fasc. XXII.) Paris, Boccard, 1939. Pp. xvi + 438. Fr. 90.

The first of these two monographs is an elaborate investigation of the ancient evidence concerning the organization of the Achaean League and of the varied and sometimes contradictory interpretations of that evidence by modern inquirers. It is singularly unfortunate that epigraphic material is still exceedingly sparse and that

in consequence students of the period are compelled to rely almost wholly on the literary sources. Though M. Aymard is sometimes a little less than fair to Polybius, it is undeniable that our chief authority on the Achaean League is often far from precise when dealing with constitutional questions and the machinery of government. This book of necessity is not easy reading, since its author, in order to meet all possible criticisms, has added beneath his text a constant stream of controversial and often very lengthy footnotes. The reader may be forgiven who should apply to parts of this book the sentence that M. Aymard has used in connection with one specific problem: "D'autre part, on a longuement et subtilement discuté pour définir la portée de la décision à laquelle aboutit cette assemblée." Nevertheless the monograph is undoubtedly a most valuable contribution to a difficult subject and will be indispensable to future investigators. Some of its conclusions are likely to win immediate acceptance, for instance, that the *synodos* was never a representative assembly, that it was older than the *synkletos*, and that the last-named did not come into existence until the last decades of the third century. Moreover, it is shown with great probability that there were each year a stated number of meetings of the *synodos*—probably four—which were fixed in advance, whereas the *synkletos* always kept the character of an extraordinary assembly, summoned when needed to deal with important decisions, especially in the sphere of foreign policy. At the same time, as M. Aymard is able to prove by many examples, there would seem to have been a good deal of overlapping, as there was no clear-cut and fixed line of demarcation between the functions exercised by the *synkletos* on the one hand and the *synodos* on the other.

Probably the hypothesis which will arouse most dissent is that Polybius used the word *boule*, not in its accepted Greek sense of a second chamber, but as synonymous with "assembly." M. Aymard, when arguing against the existence of a representative assembly in the Achaean League, adds that such a body would be unique in Greek history. One might point out in return that a Greek constitution, especially one that was at least in form democratic, without a council whose primary function was probouleutic, would be quite as unusual. As he himself admits towards the end of the book (p. 365), the only alternative in the absence of a *boule* could have been that the magistrates had the whole burden of preparing business for the assemblies. It is difficult to believe that Polybius could have so misused the word *boule*, which had had a very precise connotation for centuries. Again, if the constituent cities of the League had their own *boulai*, as a natural interpretation of Livy, XXXII, 19, 9 would seem to prove, does it not make it all the more probable that the federal government also had a council? In discussing Polybius, XXII, 8, 1-8, M. Aymard observes: "il n'est question que de *Βουλεύεσθαι* et non de *προβολεύεσθαι*, seul mot correcte si Polybe prenait *boule* dans son sens traditionnel." Surely not. Any council would have to deliberate before it framed a *probouleuma*, so that Mr. Aymard's argument seems a complete *non sequitur*. These forced interpretations of the passages in Polybius where the word *boule* occurs can be avoided,

(*J. H. S.*, LIX [1939], p. 155), if we assume that *synodos* could be used in the same way as "Congress" to signify a bicameral body.<sup>1</sup> This possibility M. Aymard has not considered at all.

The second monograph suggests to one reader at least the question whether a book of nearly four hundred pages of text and footnotes dealing with only ten years of the diplomatic relations between the Achaean League and Rome is not out of all proportion to the importance of the subject. True, the treatment covers somewhat more ground than the mere title of the work would suggest. There is an excellent summary of earlier contacts between Rome and the League, and a good deal of space is devoted to the Second Macedonian War and to the activities of Nabis. All the same, it is to be feared that this book, which, like the other, attempts to take into account all that has been written on the subject in modern times, so that the main narrative is sometimes buried under the *minutiae* of scholarship, may find few readers. This would be regrettable, for it unquestionably contains many valuable observations and deductions. The policy of Rome is shown to have been essentially opportunist from the first. M. Aymard makes it clear that already in 192 B. C. and especially after Thermopylae, though the agreement between Rome and the League was legally a *foedus aequum*, the senate had in fact determined to be the dominant partner. Excellent and thought-provoking, too, are the characterizations of leading men of affairs—with admirable impartiality M. Aymard brings out the strength and weakness of both Flamininus and Philopoimen, and even the portrait of Nabis is not wholly dark—and the treatment of episodes like the conference at Mycenae in the winter of 198/7 or the diplomatic successes of Flamininus in 191.

In conclusion, M. Aymard has written two important books which place him in the front rank of authorities on Hellenistic history. May one who has learned much from reading them respectfully suggest that undue diffuseness has a way of defeating its own ends and that much that is written on any historical period over a number of years is ephemeral and can either be ignored or passed by with a mere mention. With all respect to Horace, brevity and obscurity are not inseparable companions!

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

---

J. ENOCH POWELL. *The History of Herodotus.* (*Cambridge Classical Studies*, IV.) Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. viii + 96.

A brief preface states the author's purpose to do for Herodotus what Eduard Schwartz in his *Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* did for another Greek historian and presents in brief tabular form the results of the author's analysis in comparison with those of Kirch-

<sup>1</sup> Cary also refers to one passage in Polybius (XXIX, 24, 5) which it is impossible to explain away. M. Aymard's pardonable ignorance that Caspari and Cary are one and the same person leads to some amusing footnotes, e. g., 32, n. 3; 49, n. 1; 60, n. 1.

hoff's *Über die Abfassungszeit des Herodotischen Geschichtswerkes*. There follow five chapters: I. Cross-references, II. The History of Persia, III. The Change of Plan, IV. The Persian Wars, V. Herodotus. Two appendices give a bibliography and a table of cross-references; and two indices, lists of passages cited and of proper names.

The author's purpose is to determine the order and the chronology of the stages of Herodotus' composition of the *History* as we now have it. To the life-story of the book Powell appends a brief sketch of its author's life as it emerges from his study. According to the summary given on p. viii Books I-III, in the original form, IV, 145-205, were written in 447/4 at Athens; IV, 1-144, V, 1-10, in 444/3 at Athens; I-III, in the present form, V, 11-IX, in 430/28 at Athens. This bare skeleton is clothed and made presentable, if not beautiful, by the discussion in detail.

The critical reader is bound to acknowledge that Professor Powell has made an honest attempt to solve an involved problem and that on the whole the conclusions resulting from his study are defensible, if not always certain. This is high praise in such a case; for at countless points there is a possibility of doubt, varying in degree, regarding the legitimate inferences from passages. I myself have questioned a large number of statements, but I recognize that there is inevitably a subjective element in the decision at which one arrives in a complicated situation. I am the more conscious of this difficulty because I have for years wrestled with the same and similar problems. My student days fell in the heyday of just such studies, and I attended among others the lectures of Kirchhoff on the *Odyssey*, Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Herodotus, and Thucydides. Despite the fascination exercised by the ingenuity and cocksureness of the critics, I felt then and have felt increasingly since a stubborn reluctance to yield full assent. Being addicted to writing and to reflection on my own procedure, and being at the time blessed with an exceptional memory, I was aware that the relatively simple things I wrote might, if dissected by a captious critic, lead to absurd conclusions regarding the way in which they had been composed. The important question suggested itself what we knew *in an objective sense* about the procedure of an ancient author in composing a work of any length. Did he write it out himself or did he employ a secretary to whom he dictated? Did he write, or dictate, from copious notes or freely from memory? In planning his account did, say Herodotus, decide in advance in just what connection he should narrate this particular affair and did he adhere to his plan or deviate from it occasionally because of a momentary inspiration? If he deviated from it, would there not result duplications and omissions calling for corrections even in the first draught? How were such (to my thinking inevitable) defects to be amended? Wanting certain knowledge about these matters we are reduced to the necessity of judging largely on subjective grounds, and our conclusions will often depend on the amount of charity we are disposed to show an author.

This is simply by way of justifying myself for withholding full assent to Powell's conclusions. He depends, of course, largely on cross-references, forward or backward. When were these made? One sees at once that again and again a difference of opinion is certainly possible. In fairness it must be said that the author has

preserved a judicial attitude and has honestly endeavored to distinguish between the certain, the probable, and the barely possible, and, as has been already said, the result is praiseworthy, so far as the substance is concerned. As for the author's style, it is a pity that it should be approved, as it presumably is since it was accepted, by the Cambridge University Press. "If Lydia originally stood after ch. 140, the answer is plain. Transition to Lydia must then have been made by way of Croesus, the Lydian King who succumbed to Persia; Lydia must begin and end with Croesus" (p. 10). One may excuse such speech in a class-room; but one winces at it in a book, even when one recognizes that the dubious locutions are due to the understandable desire to compress the discussion into the smallest possible number of words. I regret to add that Powell's view of the origin and development of historiography to Thucydides (pp. 44 f.) seems to me false, though it is not original. One needs to take a much more comprehensive view of the intellectual interests of the sixth and fifth centuries B. C. and to recognize that what we call "history" was only a special form of the *ἱστορίην* then prosecuted by all the leading minds. Only so will one do justice to the pioneers.

† W. A. HEIDEL.

---

HELEN JEFFERSON LOANE. *Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome* (50 B. C.-200 A.D.). (*The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Ser. LVI, No. 2.) Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 158.

Helen Jefferson Loane's study of industry and commerce of the city of Rome was undertaken as a dissertation under the direction of Tenney Frank, and is in some sense supplementary to Volume V of the *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. The thorough and detailed research represented in this capable treatment of a limited phase of the industry of Italy under the empire constituted Mrs. Loane's special qualification for her part in the completion of that volume after Professor Frank's death.

Limits are set to the scope of this study not only by concentration on the city of Rome and its peculiar problems as capital of the empire, but by selective treatment of representative industries. The organization of the book is clear and well planned for usefulness. There are three main divisions,—imports, industry, distribution,—under which parallel lists of products are treated in separate subsections (food, clothing, building, metal work, household furnishings, luxury wares). While the different chapters inevitably cover some common ground, particularly those on imports and distribution, wastefulness has ordinarily been avoided by the use of cross-references instead of repetition of material. In each division the author has brought together significant evidence from ancient literary sources and inscriptions, supplemented wherever possible by ancient art and archaeological remains.

The chapter on imports is arranged necessarily in rather brief subsections which deal separately with a large number of products,

the amounts imported, prices, and main sources of supply. It is concluded with a section on the *stationes* maintained at Rome by foreign traders, in the discussion of which the author draws some inferences of interest on economic development, on the function of the *stationarii* as wholesalers, the absence of any evidence of middle-men as such, and the failure to develop any adequate independent organization of transportation.

The chapter on industry is the most significant for the economic history of the city and is to the reviewer the most interesting section of the book, not only for its discriminating selection of industries and the wide range of material presented, but for its capable treatment of different industries, its appraisal of the proportion between large-scale and small-shop production, and its discussion of the extent of and reasons for government interference, subsidy, and price-fixing. Evidence of small-shop industry is to be found in inscriptions of individual craftsmen and guilds, in reliefs, and in traces of small shops on the Marble Plan and in archaeological remains. Evidence of large-scale industry is drawn from epigraphical and literary references to division of labor, slave gangs, and government contracts. The author concludes that large-scale production was prevalent chiefly in industries where it was necessitated by peculiar factors, as in baking during the times when there was a bread dole, fulling and tanning which required elaborate equipment, and public building. A special section is devoted to a few larger industries,—the manufacture of *minium*, bricks, clay lamps, and lead pipes,—some of which were or gradually became government monopolies. A summary at the end of the chapter suggests reasons for the prevailing absence of large-scale industries in the city of Rome: the lack of easily available raw materials, metal and fuel; the unlimited supply of slaves in the households of the wealthy; and the ready availability in the capital of imports of every origin.

Chapter III is a topographical study of distribution within the city, in which the author gathers from various sources evidence on the location of warehouses, markets, and shops, on the machinery of distribution and its organization, and on state supervision and control. There was in general the same predominance of small-scale methods in the distribution of products as in their manufacture.

Consideration of brevity in the footnotes has at some points been allowed to outweigh consideration of the reader's convenience. Pl. and Str. do not at once suggest Pliny and Strabo, and a list of abbreviations would save some puzzling over such drastically abbreviated titles as *D.E.* and *B.C.* Still more extravagant of the reader's time is the habit of giving full titles of articles as well as books only in the place of their first appearance in the footnotes, and of referring to them thereafter solely by the author's name.

In any study involving such a wealth of detail a few errors inevitably escape the final checking. On p. 109, for example, Front., 116 cited in footnote 170 should be Front., II, 116; on p. 52 Sempronius is apparently written by mistake for Servilia (*Suet., Jul.*, 50). The few such errors which have caught the reviewer's eye are of minor importance and will not affect the value of the monograph or the admiration which it amply merits.

INEZ RYBERG.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

*Epigraphica. Rivista Italiana di Epigrafia.* Vol. I (1939). Milano, Casa Editrice Ceschina. Pp. 404.

The first fascicle of the new journal *Epigraphica* was published in September of 1938 on the occasion of the International Epigraphical Congress which was held at Amsterdam. The editor, Aristide Calderini, has given us in the foreword a brief statement of his purpose to provide a journal to be devoted exclusively to the field of inscriptions. It will treat of all aspects of the discipline from the publication of new documents to the review of books which depend even in part on epigraphical study, and one important section of it will be a bibliographical bulletin.

The volume as finally issued contains a wide variety of articles and reviews, and a very extensive bulletin has been prepared by Calderini and his colleagues. This bulletin is a useful addition to those already made available by Tod in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, by Robert and others in the *Revue Archéologique*, and by Miss Ernst in Marouzeau's *l'Année Philologique*. The catholic nature of the reviews may be illustrated by the fact that one of them (p. 205) is devoted to De Sanctis, *Storia dei Greci*. The connection here with epigraphical study is not obvious, even after the editor's explanations, but Calderini may perhaps be pardoned for citing these volumes as one step in what he calls "the methodical and sure rise of our country toward a more radiant future." Where so much is given one ought not to feel that even this additional item is out of place.

There is at least one curious omission. Those who were fortunate enough to receive the first fascicle as it was published in 1938 will note that it contains an article by Paribeni (pp. 5-8) followed by an article from the pen of Mario Segre, "Il processo tra i Calimnii e i figli di Diagora di Coo" (pp. 9-16). In the volume as finally issued in 1939, Segre's article with its two illustrations was suppressed. Paribeni's article was repaged from 5-8 to 13-16, and its one illustration was called Fig. 1-3 so that the numbering of figures throughout the volume might remain consecutive even with Segre's article omitted. The remaining lacuna was taken up by an 8-page article written by the editor, in which he makes some observations about epigraphical congresses in general and about the one in Amsterdam in particular. It is a poor substitute for Segre, and no explanation is offered for this extraordinary suppression of an article already published, or for the repaging of its companion piece. In a journal which has as one of its purposes the facilitation of bibliographical reference, such editorial leger-de-main creates inexcusable confusion. The reader, we believe, is entitled to some explanation.

It may be noted, however, that Segre did not suffer complete *damnatio memoriae*, for six articles of his are cited in the bibliography, and he is once praised (p. 241) as the man "who has done so much for the epigraphy of the Italian islands of the Aegean." But there is no reference in the bibliography to the suppressed article and students of epigraphy will doubtless be puzzled when they search their references to it in the final version of this volume.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY.

M. Terenti Varronis, *De Vita Populi Romani*. Edited by BENEDETTO RIPOSATI. (*Pubblicazioni dell' Università Cattolica del S. Cuore*, Ser. IV, Vol. XXXIII.) Milan, Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1939. Pp. x + 320. L. 30.

The remains of this work of Varro had been previously collected by Hermann Kettner in a Halle dissertation of 1863, listing 118 fragments as compared with Riposati's 129. The advances here made, however, are to be reckoned less on quantitative than on scholarly grounds, and the present work lays much stress on its critical appraisal of the materials. A brief bibliography is followed by an enumeration and criticism of those authors who cite the *De Vita Populi Romani* (in which Nonius, the preserver of 123 fragments, is naturally prominent), a discussion of the title, the number of books (clearly four), the dedication to Atticus, the date (between 47 and 32 B. C.), and the later tradition (extending to Nonius), followed by over 150 pages dealing with the authenticity of the fragments, their subject-matter, and their assignment to definite places in the work. According to Riposati's reconstruction (p. 259) the first book corresponds roughly to the period of the monarchy, the second extends from the founding of the Republic to the First Punic War, the third to the end of the Third Punic War, and the last to Varro's own day. These limits are not, however, rigidly fixed, nor is the purpose of the work concerned so much with the sequence of events as with Roman life seen as a varied picture, its virtues, vices, glories, humiliations, public and private institutions, and religious and domestic rites. Though Varro's method depends on that of the *βίος Ἑλλάδος* of Dicaearchus, his intention is rather to hold up to the admiring imitation of his contemporaries the *mores antiqui* of their ancestors. The 129 fragments themselves are set forth on pp. 273-316, each provided with a twofold apparatus, containing (1) references to the ancient authors in which it is preserved (with citation of modern scholarly literature dealing with the fragment) and (2) a statement of manuscript variants, emendations, and such matters as naturally belong in an *apparatus criticus*. An index of proper names and one of noteworthy words close the volume.

The editor controls the literature of his subject pretty fully and shows good sense and conservatism in deciding the small but controversial questions arising in the course of the study. It is the more to be regretted that the otherwise excellent impression made by his work is marred by not a few misprints of Latin words, such as Nonuis (p. 75), mustell. (Mostellaria, p. 228), ommem (omnem, p. 294), sempre (semper, p. 306), carba ineus (carbasineus, p. 318), occasional errors in Greek (e. g. p. 152), frequent slips in English (e. g. religious experiance, p. 115) and German (five mistakes in seven lines on p. 9), not to speak of Italian itself (eumeristico, p. 268). Foreign scholars appear in unfamiliar guise, e.g., Temney Frank (p. 215) and P. M. Nilsson (p. 224). At p. 258, n. 3, an entire line is transposed. Despite these blemishes and the possibility that other scholars may still prefer to arrange some of the materials in a different order, this volume will probably long remain the standard edition of the *De Vita* and may offer useful suggestions in method to editors of Varro's other fragmentary works.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Alexander (William Hardy). *Seneca's Epistulae Morales, The Text Emended and Explained (I-LXV).* (*Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 5 [1940], pp. 57-88.)

Andrew (S. O.). *Syntax and Style in Old English.* Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Co., 1940. Pp. 112. \$2.50.

Berry (Edmund Grindlay). *The History and Development of the Concept of θεῖα μοίη and θεῖα τύχη down to and including Plato.* Private ed., distributed by the Univ. of Chicago Libraries, 1940. Pp. iii + 89. (Diss.)

Bowen (Ray P.). *The Dramatic Construction of Balzac's Novels.* Eugene, *Univ. of Oregon*, 1940. Pp. v + 128. \$1. (*Univ. of Oregon Monographs, Studies in Literature and Philology*, No. 3.)

Cambridge (The) *Bibliography of English Literature.* Vol. I: A. D. 600-1660; Vol. II: 1660-1800; Vol. III: 1800-1900; Vol. IV: Index. Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Co., 1941. Pp. xl + 912; xx + 1003; xxii + 1098; 287. \$32.50.

Careopino (Jérôme). *Daily Life in Ancient Rome.* Translated by E. O. Lorimer. Edited with Bibliography and Notes by Henry T. Rowell. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xv + 342; illus. \$4.

Duncan (Sir Patrick). *The Place of Art in Plato's Ideal State.* Reprinted from the *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, X, 1 (1940), pp. 27-38.

Goldschmidt (R. C.). *Paulinus' Churches at Nola.* Texts, Translations and Commentary. Amsterdam, N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1940. Pp. 203; 1 plate. fl. 4.50.

Hunt (Edmund). *Iohannis Dominicci Lucula Noctis.* Notre Dame, Ind., 1940. Pp. xxxi + 432. (*Univ. of Notre Dame Publ. in Mediaeval Studies*, IV.)

Koch (Sister Marie Pierre). *An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature with Special Reference to the "Biblical-Creed-Narrative" Prayers.* Washington, D. C., Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 204. (Diss.)

Meritt (Benjamin Dean). *Epigraphica Attica.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xi + 157. (*Martin Classical Lectures*, IX.)

Pando (Rev. José C.). *The Life and Times of Synesius of Cyrene as revealed in his works.* Washington, D. C., Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1940. Pp. xix + 186. (*Patristic Studies*, LXIII.)

Roberts (Frank H. H., Jr.). *Archeological Remains in the White-water District, Eastern Arizona.* Part II: Artifacts and Burials. With Appendix, Skeletal Remains from the Whitewater District, Eastern Arizona, by T. D. Stewart. U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1940. Pp. xi + 170; 57 plates; 44 text figures. (*Smithsonian Inst., Bureau of Am. Ethnology, Bull.* 126.)

Sturtevant (Edgar H.). *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin,* 2nd edition. Philadelphia, publ. for Yale Univ. by the Linguistic Society of America, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1940. Pp. 192. (*William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*).

Teykowski (Hans). *Der Präpositionsgebrauch bei Menander.* Bonner Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1940. Pp. 93.

## INDEX TO VOLUME LXII.

PAGE		PAGE
Agrarian Legislation, Solon's, 144-156		Chinese, An Ancient Military Contact Between Romans and, 322-330
ALEXANDER, WILLIAM H. Four Suggestions for Seneca, <i>E. M. CIV</i> , 485-489		CLEMENT, PAUL A. Chronological Notes on the Issues of Several Greek Mints, 157-168
ALLEN, WALTER, JR. The <i>Tertentianus</i> of the <i>περὶ ὕψους</i> , 51-64		Cleomedes and the Meridian of Lysimachia, 344-347
Antioch, The Wall of Theodosius at, 207-213		COPLEY, FRANK O. Horace, <i>Odes</i> , III, 5, 13-18, 87-89
ἀποταῖδαριώ, καθαπτάτ, ἀσσάλιος, πρόφασις in Late Greek, Four Lexicographical Notes, 451-459		Juvenal, <i>Sat.</i> , I, 1, 147-150, 219-221
Aristotelian (The) Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric, 35-50, 169-190		Dieuchidas, A Note on the Megarian Historian, 348-351
Aristotle's <i>Politics</i> , IV, xii, 11-13 (Text and Interpretation), 416-425		DILLER, AUBREY. A New Source on the Spartan <i>Ephebia</i> , 499-501
Asklepios, Note on the Priests of, 358-360		* <i>do-</i> , * <i>do-ie-</i> , * <i>do-ye-</i> , * <i>do-ge-</i> , The Indo-European Base-Type, 476-484
ἀσσάλιος, ἀποταῖδαριώ, καθ- <i>απτάτ</i> , πρόφασις in Late Greek, Four Lexicographical Notes, 451-459		DOWNEY, GLANVILLE. The Wall of Theodosius at Antioch, 207-213
Augustus from Prima Porta, The Date of the, 496-499		DUBS, HOMER H. An Ancient Military Contact Between Romans and Chinese, 322-330
Augustus, Vergil and the Forum of, 261-276		EDELSTEIN, LUDWIG. Horace, <i>Odes</i> , II, 7, 9-10, 441-451
BATES, WILLIAM NICKEBSON. The Euripides Papyri, 469-475		<i>Ephebia</i> , Spartan, A New Source on the, 499-501
Bithynica, 191-198		Etruscan and Latin Month-Names, On, 199-206
BONNER, CAMPBELL. Four Lexicographical Notes: ἀποταῖδαριώ, καθαπτάτ, ἀσσάλιος, πρόφασις in Late Greek, 451-459		Euripides, <i>Ion</i> , 1610, 229
BOOKS RECEIVED, 127-128, 255-256 383-384, 515		Euripides (The) Papyri, 469-475
Boule (The) of 500 from Salamis to Ephialtes, 224-226		Flamininus, T. Quintius, The Military and Diplomatic Campaign of, in 198 B.C., 277-288
BURRISS, ELI E. Two Notes on Petronius, 356-358		FONTENROSE, JOSEPH E. On the Particle <i>πω</i> in Homer, 65-79
Catullus, 5, 7-11 and the Abacus, 222-224		FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. Menander's <i>Epitrepones</i> , 722-25
Cena <i>Trimalchionis</i> , A Note on the Location of, 494-496		Körte (646-49 Jensen), 354-356

PAGE	PAGE
†FRANK, TENNEY. Our Changing Program, 257-260	LAKE, AGNES KIRSOPP. A Note on the Location of the <i>Cena Trimalchionis</i> , 494-496
FRIEDLÄNDER, PAUL. Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius, 16-34	Legion, the Third Cyrenaic, The Origin of, 84-87
GIFFLER, MILTON. The Boule of 500 from Salamis to Ephialtes, 224-226	LEVY, HARRY L. Catullus, 5, 7-11 and the Abacus, 222-224
<i>γούρα: ols</i> "Sheep," On the Hesychian Gloss, 89-91	LEWIS, NAPHTALI. Solon's Agrarian Legislation, 144-156
Gold Standard, The Roman, and the Ancient Sources, 289-301	Lucretius, Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in, 16-34
GRAY, LOUIS H. The Hesychian Gloss <i>γούρα: ols</i> "Sheep," 89-91	Lysimachia, Cleomedes and the Meridian of, 344-347
The Indo-European Base-Type *do-, *do-ie-, *do-ye-, *do-e-, 476-484	McDIARMID, JOHN B. Note on Heraclitus, Fragment 124, 492-494
Greek Sentence Construction, A Study of, 385-415	Marathon, The Slaves at the Battle of, 352-354
Heraclitus, Fragment 124, Note on, 492-494	Menander, Notes on, 460-468
Hesychian (The) Gloss <i>γούρα: ols</i> "Sheep," 89-91	Menander's <i>Epitrepones</i> , 722-25 Körte (646-49 Jensen), 354-356
HOENIGSWALD, H. M. On Etruscan and Latin Month-Names, 199-206	MERRITT, BENJAMIN D. New Fragments of the Tribute Lists, 1-15
Homer, On the Particle <i>πω</i> in, 65-79	MERRITT, HERBERT. Three Studies in Old English, 331-339
Horace, <i>Odes</i> , II, 9-10, 441-451	Mints, Greek, Chronological Notes on the Issues of Several, 157-168
Horace, <i>Odes</i> , III, 5, 13-18, 87-89	Month-Names, On Etruscan and Latin, 199-206
<i>Hymn to Apollo</i> , Integration and the, 302-313	MORROW, GLENN R. On the Tribal Courts in Plato's <i>Laws</i> , 314-321
<i>In Die Mortis = In Die(m) Mortis</i> and Roman Marital Felicity, 227-228	MÜLLER, VALENTIN. The Date of the Augustus from Prima Porta, 496-499
Integration and the <i>Hymn to Apollo</i> , 302-313	NEUGEBAUER, O. Cleomedes and the Meridian of Lysimachia, 344-347
JOHNSON, S. Sophocles, <i>Ajax</i> 112: A Study in Sophoclean Syntax and Interpretation, 214-218	NORWOOD, GILBERT. Pindar, <i>Pythian</i> , II, 72 ff., 340-343
Juvenal, <i>Sat.</i> , I, 1, 147-150, 219-221	Notice of C. A. A. S., 127
<i>καθαπτάι</i> , <i>ἀποπαιδαρίω</i> , <i>ἀστάλιος</i> , <i>πρόφασις</i> in Late Greek, Four Lexicographical Notes, 451-459	Notice of New Microfilm Service at Library of Congress, 383
KIEFFER, J. S. Note on Plato, <i>Laws</i> 722 c 1, 91-92	NOTOPOULOS, JAMES A. The Slaves at the Battle of Marathon, 352-354
KNIGHT, W. F. J. Integration and the <i>Hymn to Apollo</i> , 302-313	Old English, Three Studies in, 331-339
	OLDFATHER, W. A. <i>In Die Mortis = In Die(m) Mor-</i>

PAGE	PAGE
<i>tis</i> and Roman Marital Felicity, 227-228 <i>O. Mich.</i> I, 154, 80-83 Our Changing Program, 257-260	Related Subjects in Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> VII, 1-135 (WILLIAM CHARLES KORF-MACHER), 239-241
Papyri, The Euripides, 469-475 PARKE, H. W. The Sources of Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> , III, 692-705, 490-492	Brown, <i>see</i> Rostovtzeff. <i>Cary's</i> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>The Roman Antiquities</i> , II (Books III-IV; L. C. L.) (NORMAN W. DEWITT), 123
Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius, 16-34	<i>Degrassi's</i> Inscriptiones Italiæ, XIII: Fasti et Elogia, Fasc. III, Elogia (LILY ROSS TAYLOR), 379-380
PEARL, ORSAMUS M. <i>O. Mich.</i> I, 154 (with HERBERT C. YOUTIE), 80-83	<i>Denniston's</i> Euripides, <i>Electra</i> (FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN), 373-374
<i>περὶ ὕψους</i> , The Terentianus of the, 51-64	<i>De Sanctis'</i> Storia dei Greci dalle origini alla fine del secolo V (M. L. W. LAISTNER), 375-376
Petronius, Two Notes on, 356-358 Pindar, <i>Pythian</i> , II, 72 ff., 340-343	<i>Devoto's</i> Storia della lingua di Roma (J. WHATMOUGH), 378-379
Pity, Topics of, in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, 426-440	<i>Epigraphica, Rivista Italiana di Epigrafia</i> , I (BENJAMIN D. MERITT), 513
Plato, <i>Laws</i> 722 c 1, Note on, 91-92	<i>Evelyn White</i> and <i>Oliver's</i> The Temple of Hibis in El Khârgeh Oasis, Part II: Greek Inscriptions (HERBERT C. YOUTIE), 502-505
Plato's <i>Laws</i> , On the Tribal Courts in, 314-321	<i>Fields'</i> The Technique of Exposition in Roman Comedy (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH), 116-118
POST, L. A. Notes on Menander, 460-468	<i>Frank's</i> An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, V: Rome and Italy of the Empire (VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA), 230-236
PRAKKEN, DONALD W. A Note on the Megarian Historian Dieuchidas, 348-351	<i>Friedländer's</i> Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza: des Prokopios von Gaza "Εκφρασις Εἰκόνος" (GLANVILLE DOWNEY), 381-382
PRITCHETT, W. KENDRICK. Note on the Priests of Asklepios, 358-360	<i>Fuchs'</i> Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt (M. L. W. LAISTNER), 118-119
<i>πρόφασις</i> in Late Greek, <i>ἀποταῖδαριών, καθαπτάται, ἀστάλιος</i> , Four Lexicographical Notes, 451-459	<i>Galdi's</i> Saggi Boeziani (EDMUND T. SILK), 112-114
<i>πω</i> , On the Particle, in Homer, 65-79	<i>Gilbert and Kuhn's</i> A History of Esthetics (GEORGE BOAS), 126-127
<i>Ratio &gt; Race</i> , 129-143	
<b>REVIEWS:</b>	
<i>Aymard's Les Assemblées de la Confédération Achaienne</i> (M. L. W. LAISTNER), 507-509	
<i>Aymard's Les premiers Rapports de Rome et de la Confédération Achaienne, 198-189 avant J.-C.</i> (M. L. W. LAISTNER), 507-509	
<i>Boas' Aeneas' Arrival in Latium: Observations on Legends, History, Religion, Topography and</i>	

PAGE	PAGE
<i>Härleman's De Claudio Mamerto Gallicae Latinitatis Scriptore Quæstiones</i> (JACOB HAMMER), 246-248	<i>Antiquity</i> (MARGARETE BIEBER), 241-244
<i>Heichelheim's Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums</i> , I: Text; II: Notes and Index (ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON), 361-367	<i>MacLennan's Oxyrhynchus: an Economic and Social Study</i> (CLINTON W. KEYES), 251-252
<i>Jeanmaire's La Sibylle et le retour de l'âge d'or</i> (DAVID M. ROBINSON), 367-370	<i>Malcovati's L. Annaei Flori Quæ Exstant</i> (LLOYD W. DALY), 370-372
<i>Jones' The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces</i> (T. R. S. BROUGHTON), 104-107	<i>Mihăescu's Dioscoride Latino, Materia Medica, Libro primo</i> (HENRY E. SIGERIST), 124-125
<i>Jonkers' Invloed van het Christendom op de Romeinsche wetgeving betreffende het concubinat en de echtscheiding</i> (WILLIAM M. GREEN), 120-122	<i>Moorhead, see Smith.</i>
<i>Jouai's De Magistraat Ausonius</i> (E. T. SALMON), 248-249	<i>Mugler's L'Évolution des Constructions Participiales complexes en Grec et en Latin</i> (JAMES W. POULTNEY), 252-253
<i>Klingner's Q. Horati Flacci Carmina</i> (ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY), 122-123	<i>Oliver, see Evelyn White.</i>
<i>Koerste's Menandri Quae Supersunt, Pars Prior: Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Vetustissimis Servatae</i> (PHILIP W. HARSH), 101-104	<i>Olzscha's Interpretation der agramer Mumienbinde</i> (J. WHATMOUGH), 505-507
<i>Kuhn, see Gilbert.</i>	<i>Packer's Cicero's Presentation of Epicurean Ethics</i> (NORMAN W. DEWITT), 124
<i>Kuiper's Two Comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus, Terence's Hecyra and Phormio</i> (JOHN N. HOUGH), 237-239	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i> , XIV (N. S. I) (LILY ROSS TAYLOR), 380-381
<i>Laureae Aquincenses Memoriae Valentini Kuzsin-szky Dictatae, I</i> (HOWARD COMFORT), 250-251	<i>Piganiol's Histoire de Rome</i> (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD), 382-383
<i>Loane's Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome</i> (50 B. C.-200 A. D.) (INEZ RYBERG), 511-512	<i>Powell's The History of Herodotus</i> (W. A. HEIDEL), 509-511
<i>Lowe's Codices Latini Antiquiores, A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century, Part III, Italy: Ancona-Novara</i> (MARBURY B. OGLE), 254	<i>Riposati's M. Terenti Varronis De Vita Populi Romani</i> (ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE), 514
<i>McDermott's The Ape in</i>	<i>Rostovtzeff, Brown, and Welles' The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Preliminary Report of the Seventh and Eighth Seasons of Work, 1933-1934 and 1934-1935</i> (GLANVILLE DOWNEY), 107-110
	<i>Sanford's The Mediterranean World in Ancient Times</i> (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD), 125-126
	<i>Schnabel's Text und Karten des Ptolemäus</i> (WALTER WOODBURN HYDE), 244-246
	<i>Smith and Moorhead's A Short History of the Ancient World</i> (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD), 125-126

PAGE	
<i>Trever's History of Ancient Civilization</i> , I: The Ancient Near East and Greece; II: The Roman World (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD),	125-126
<i>Triantaphyllides' Νεοελληνική Γραμματική, πρῶτος τόμος, ιστορική εἰσαγωγή</i> (SHIRLEY H. WEBER),	114-116
<i>Wallace's Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian</i> (HERBERT C. YOUTIE),	93-101
Welles, <i>see</i> Rostovtzeff.	
<i>Wilson's The Clothing of the Ancient Romans</i> (CATHERINE SAUNDERS),	110-112
<i>Winterscheidt's Aigina: Eine Untersuchung über seine Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft</i> (PAUL A. CLEMENT),	119-120
<i>Zuntz' Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri</i> (JAMES T. ALLEN),	376-377
Rhetoric, Ancient, The Aristotelian Tradition in,	35-50, 169-190
Romans and Chinese, An Ancient Military Contact Between,	322-330
ROSELL, HENRY T. Vergil and the Forum of Augustus,	261-276
SANDERS, H. A. The Origin of the Third Cyrenaic Legion,	84-87
Seneca, E. M. CIV, Four Suggestions for,	485-489
"Sheep," The Hesychian Gloss γούρα: ὄλς,	89-91
Slaves (The) at the Battle of Marathon,	352-354
SOLMSEN, FRIEDRICH. The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric,	35-50, 169-190
Solon's Agrarian Legislation,	
144-156	
Sophocles, <i>Ajax</i> 112: A Study in Sophoclean Syntax and Interpretation,	
214-218	
SPITZER, LEO. <i>Ratio &gt; Race</i> ,	
129-143	
STEVENS, EDWARD B. Topics of Pity in the Poetry of the Roman Republic,	
426-440	
Terentianus (The) of the περὶ ὕψους,	
51-64	
Theodosius, The Wall of, at Antioch,	
207-213	
TOD, MARCUS N. <i>Bithynica</i> ,	
191-198	
TODD, O. J. Aristotle's <i>Politics</i> , IV, xii, 11-13 (Text and Interpretation),	
416-425	
Tribal Courts in Plato's <i>Laws</i> , On the,	
314-321	
Tribute Lists, New Fragments of the,	
1-15	
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> , III, 692-705, The Sources of,	
490-492	
Vergil and the Forum of Augustus,	
261-276	
WASSERMANN, FELIX. Euripides, <i>Ion</i> , 1610,	
229	
WEBSTER, T. B. L. A Study of Greek Sentence Construction,	
385-415	
WEST, LOUIS C. The Roman Gold Standard and the Ancient Sources,	
289-301	
WOOD, FREDERIC M., JR. The Military and Diplomatic Campaign of T. Quintius Flamininus in 198 B.C.	
277-288	
YOUTIE, HERBERT C. <i>O. Mich.</i> I, 154 (with ORSAMUS M. PEARL),	
80-83	

OCT 13 1941

VOL. LXII, 4

WHOLE NO. 248

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

AMERICAN  
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

HAROLD CHERNISS

KEMP MALONE, BENJAMIN D. MERITT  
DAVID M. ROBINSON, HENRY T. ROWELL

OCTOBER, 1941

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
A Study of Greek Sentence Construction. By T. B. L. WEBSTER,	385
Aristotle's <i>Politics</i> , IV, xii, 11-13 (Text and Interpretation). By O. J. TODD,	416
Topics of Pity in the Poetry of the Roman Republic. By EDWARD B. STEVENS,	426
Horace, <i>Odes</i> , II, 7, 9-10. By LUDWIG EDELSTEIN,	441
Four Lexicographical Notes. By CAMPBELL BONNER,	451
Notes on Menander. By L. A. POST,	460
The Euripides Papyri. By WILLIAM NICKERSON BATES,	469
The Indo-European Base-Type *do-, *do-je-, *do-ye-, *do-æ-. By LOUIS H. GRAY,	476
Four Suggestions for Seneca, <i>E. M. CIV.</i> By WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER,	485
The Sources of Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> , III, 692-705. By H. W. PARKE,	490
Note on Heraclitus, Fragment 124. By JOHN B. McDIARMID,	492
A Note on the Location of the <i>Cena Trimalchionis</i> . By AGNES KIRSOPP LAKE,	494
The Date of the Augustus from Prima Porta. By VALENTIN MÜLLER,	496
A New Source on the Spartan <i>Ephebia</i> . By AUBREY DILLER,	499
<b>REVIEWS:</b>	<b>502</b>
<i>Evelyn White and Oliver's The Temple of Hibis in El Khärgeh Oasis, Part II: Greek Inscriptions</i> (HERBERT C. YOUTIE).— <i>Olszcha's Interpretation der agramer Mumienbinde</i> (J. WHATMOUGH).— <i>Aymard's Les Assemblées de la Confédéra- tion Achaienne and Les premiers Rapports de Rome et de la Confédération Achaienne, 198-189 avant J.-C.</i> (M. L. W. LAISTNER).— <i>Powell's The History of Herodotus</i> († W. A. HEIDEL).— <i>Loane's Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome</i> (50 B. C.-200 A. D.) (INEZ RYBERG).— <i>Epigraphica: Rivista Italiana di Epigrafia</i> , Vol. I (1939) (BENJAMIN D. MERITT).— <i>Riposati's M. Terenti Varronis De Vita Populi Romani</i> (ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE).	
<b>BOOKS RECEIVED,</b>	<b>515</b>
<b>INDEX TO VOLUME LXII,</b>	<b>516</b>

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Harold Cherniss; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

---

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore,  
Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

# An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome

- I. *Rome and Italy of the Republic.* By TENNEY FRANK. 445 pages. Now out of print.
- II. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian.* By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. 742 pages, \$4.00.
- III. *The Four Western Provinces.* By R. G. COLLINGWOOD; J. J. VAN NOSTRAND; V. M. SCRAMUZZA; and ALBERT GRENIER. 672 pages. \$4.00.
- IV. *Roman Africa,* by R. M. HAYWOOD, 120 pp.  
*Roman Syria,* by F. M. HEICHELHEIM, 133 pp.  
*Roman Greece,* by J. A. O. LARSEN, 240 pp.  
*Roman Asia,* by T R. S. BROUGHTON. 420 pp.  
Indices. 950 pages, \$5.00.
- V. *Rome and Italy of the Empire,* by TENNEY FRANK, 461 pages.  
*General Index to Volumes I-V,* 146 pages. 2 volumes \$5.75.

---

## ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 432 pages, \$4.00.

## THE SYNTAX OF THE GENITIVE CASE IN ARISTOPHANES

By JAMES WILSON POULTNEY. 250 pages, \$3.50.

## SELECTIONS FROM THE BRIEF MENTION OF BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. 546 pages, frontispiece, \$4.50.

## STUDIES IN HONOR OF HERMANN COLLITZ

By American and foreign scholars. 341 pages, frontispiece, \$5.00.

## L'AGNIHOTRA: Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique

Par P.-E. DUMONT. xv + 225 pages, \$3.00 paper and \$3.50 cloth.

## L'ÍSVARAGÍTÁ, LE CHANT DE SÍVA

Texte extrait du Kurma-purāná. Traduit du Sanskrit par P.-E. DUMONT. 251 pages, paper, \$3.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

# THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY DAVID M. ROBINSON

1. THE ROMAN TOGA. By Lillian M. Wilson. 132 pages. 102 illustrations. \$5.00.
2. THE HISTORY AND CIVILIZATION OF ANCIENT MEGARA. By E. L. Highbarger. 234 pages. 6 illustrations. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
3. ANCIENT SICYON WITH A PROSOPOGRAPHIA SICYONIA. By Charles H. Skalet. 234 pages. 17 illustrations. \$2.50.
4. THE NEGRO IN GREEK AND ROMAN CIVILIZATION: A STUDY OF THE ETHIOPIAN TYPE. By Grace Hadley Beardsley. 154 pages. 24 illustrations. \$3.50.
5. LES CULTES DE PATRAS: AVEC UNE PROSOPOGRAPHIE PATRÉENNE. By Jules Herbillon. 199 pages. \$3.00.
6. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART I. THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT. By George E. Mylonas. 126 pages. 96 plates. \$7.50.
7. THE GREEK TRADITION IN SCULPTURE. By Walter R. Agard. 70 pages. 34 illustrations. \$3.00.
8. ANCIENT CORINTH, WITH A TOPOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE CORINTHIA. PART I. FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO 404 B.C. By J. G. O'Neill. 270 pages. 9 plates and large folded plan of excavations. \$5.00.
9. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART II. ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE. By David M. Robinson. 177 pages. 315 illustrations. \$20.00.
10. PAPYRI IN THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COLLECTIONS. Edited by Allan Chester Johnson and Henry Bartlett Van Hoesen. 169 pages. \$7.50.
11. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART III. THE COINS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS. By David M. Robinson. 143 pages. 28 plates. \$10.00.
12. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART IV. THE TERRA-COTTAS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS. By David M. Robinson. 119 pages. 62 plates. \$10.00.
13. SCULPTURED PORTRAITS OF GREEK STATESMEN: WITH A SPECIAL STUDY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT. By Elmer G. Suhr. 202 pages. 21 plates. \$4.50.
14. HELLENISTIC QUEENS: A STUDY OF WOMAN-POWER IN MACEDONIA, SELEUCID SYRIA, AND PTOLEMAIC EGYPT. By Grace Harriet Macurdy. 265 pages. 12 plates. \$4.00.
15. EARLY CIVILIZATION IN THESSALY. By Hazel D. Hansen. 222 pages. 178 illustrations. \$4.00.
16. OLD AGE AMONG THE ANCIENT GREEKS. By Bessie Ellen Richardson. 391 pages. 16 plates. \$4.00.
17. A HISTORY OF OLYNTHUS. By Mabel Gude. 122 pages. \$2.50.
18. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART V. MOSAICS, VASES, AND LAMPS OF OLYNTHUS FOUND IN 1928 AND 1931. By David M. Robinson. 320 pages. 209 plates. \$15.00.
19. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VI. THE COINS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS IN 1931. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. 30 plates. \$10.00.
20. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VII. THE TERRA-COTTAS OF OLYNTHUS FOUND IN 1931. By David M. Robinson. 123 pages. 61 plates. \$10.00.
21. PINDAR: A POET OF ETERNAL IDEAS. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. \$3.00.
22. VASSAL-QUEENS AND SOME CONTEMPORARY WOMEN UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By Grace H. Macurdy. 160 pages. 6 plates. \$3.00.
23. A STUDY OF THE GREEK LOVE-NAMES, INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF PAEDERASTY AND A PROSOPOGRAPHIA. By David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck. 212 pages. 1 plate. \$3.00.
24. THE CLOTHING OF THE ANCIENT ROMANS. By Lillian M. Wilson. 191 pages. 118 illustrations. \$5.00.
25. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VIII. THE HELLENIC HOUSE. By David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham. 391 pages. 36 figures and 111 plates. \$15.00.
26. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART IX. THE CHALCIDIC MINT AND THE EXCAVATION COINS FOUND IN 1928-1934. By David M. Robinson and Paul Augustus Clement. 446 pages. 36 plates. \$15.00.
27. THE APE IN ANTIQUITY. By William C. McDermott. 349 pages. 10 plates. \$5.00.
28. ETRUSCAN PERUGIA. By Chandler Shaw. 115 pages. 16 plates. \$2.75.
29. THE COMMON PEOPLE OF POMPEII: A STUDY OF THE GRAFFITI. By Helen H. Tanzer. 113 pages, 49 illustrations, \$3.50.
30. THE GATES OF DREAMS. AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF VERGIL, *Aeneid* VI, 893-899. By E. L. Highbarger. 149 pages. 15 illustrations. \$3.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

